DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 190 UD 023 324

AUTHOR	Scott, Marie; Guy, R. Meade
TITLE	Collaborative for Alabama Urban School Educators. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Alabama State Dept. of Education, Montgomery. Div. of Legislative Relations and Research.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Aug 83
CONTRACT	400-81-0008
NOTE	177p.; Pages 27-52 have small broken type.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Agency Cooperation; *Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; *Information Utilization; *Interdistrict Policies; Problem Solving; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Research and Development; State Departments of Education; *State School District Relationship; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*Alabama

ABSTRACT

The major purpose of Project CAUSE (Collaborative for Alabama Urban School Educators) as explained in section I of this report was to get educators in the Birmingham and Mobile school systems, in the Alabama State Department of Education, and in the Appalachia Educational Laboratory to (1) collaborate in identifying and solving problems; and (2) consider research and development (R & D) as a vital and practical source of support for local improvement efforts. Year 1 (1981-82) of the project was devoted to the planning and establishment of meaningful patterns of cooperation between educators in the member agencies. Year 2 (1982-83) was to have been the first of several implementation years but was the only operational year funded. Sections II, III, and IV present, in chart form, a review of major Project CAUSE accomplishments and show that most objectives were met or exceeded. Especially significant is said to have been the collaboration achieved between the Birmingham and Mobile urban school systems. Section V (prepared by Thomas P. Ryan), provides a descriptive summary of major events of the implementation year, a tentative assessment of some project outcomes, and suggestions for a follow-up study. Together with Section VI, it provides additional insights into and implications for the development of viable collaborative relationships and/or the building of a school district's capacity to make local improvements through the use of R & D information. Appendices contain minutes from CAUSE policy meetings, a summary of a CAUSE conference, policy meeting evaluation materials, dissemination conference agendas and evaluation forms, and questionnaires for the proposed follow-up. (CMG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED240190

Collaborative for

Alabama Urban School Educators

Final Report

by

Marie Scott, Coordinator
and
R. Meade Guy, Project Director

August 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Wayne Teague
Alabama State Dept. of Education
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Office of Research
Division of Legislative Relations and Research
Alabama Department of Education
Montgomery, Alabama 36130

Wayne Teague, State Superintendent
of Education

Contract Number 400-81-0008

ED033324

I. Introduction

Project CAUSE, Collaborative for Alabama Urban School Educators, includes the Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL), the Alabama State Department of Education, the Birmingham (Alabama) City School System, and the Mobile County (Alabama) School System. This project was funded primarily by a grant from the National Institute of Education (NIE), though substantial fiscal and human resources have been contributed by its member agencies, other cooperating agencies and individuals. Project activities offically began in January, 1981, and ended in May, 1983.

CAUSE was originally designed with the expectation of substantial, multiple-year funding. Planning year activities followed the proposed design and resulted in successful establishment of meaningful patterns of cooperation between educators in the member agencies needed to (1) develop the concept of collaboration and (2) build the collaborative.

Unfortunately, year two, which was to have been the first of several implementation years, turned out to be the only operational year funded. NIE's inability to provide continuation funding as originally intended necessitated reconsideration of CAUSE's future. After much discussion and deliberation, those who had been heavily involved in and committed to the Project decided to continue the Collaborative despite a sense of frustration and disappointment. These unanticipated constraints created major problems/concerns requiring immediate attention and redirection: (1) serious doubts were expressed by many as to the value of continuing with unrealistic funding and insufficient time as needed to accomplish the stated purposes; (2) a dramatic (yet understandable) lessening of the intense enthusiasm, interest, and committment attained during year one and the resultant loss of momentum and incentive; (3) a marked reduction in Project scope (e.g., limited number of schools and participants, underfunding placed greater demand on other

resources, lowering of original expectations and restructuring of priorities).

The purposes of CAUSE were: (1) to increase the capacity of urban educators in eligible school systems in this region to use resources available through RD&D agencies and, as a by-product, to strengthen their own internal RD&D capability; (2) to develop linkages between the eligible urban systems and build upon linkages currently existing between the offeror and other parties to CAUSE; (3) to constitute a collaborative that is viable and effective in serving the needs of its members and that can serve as a model for locales and agencies with similar characteristics and needs; and (4) to direct the above purposes as means toward the end of improving educational policies and practices and increasing equity within collaborating agencies.

In the process of reviewing and/or assessing the Project one must understand pre-existing conditions as well as the context in which it has operated. To begin with, the Urban Team's RFP dictated the Collaborative's purposes (to establish a collaborative which would enhance the ability of urban educators to utilize RD&D in improvement of urban schools and schooling). Secondly, there had never been an emphasis on urbanism nor even purposeful consideration of the uniqueness of urban school systems and schools within Alabama. In addition, certain constraints, specific to the histories of the Collaborative's member agencies, have been instrumental in determining many of the Project's activities and accoomplishments as well as it's structure and viability. For example, the SDE had previously been perceived as a regulatory body rather than a "partner" in local school improvement. Consequently, the two urban LEAs were neither requesting nor receiving much guidance or assistance in the solution of their specific needs/problems/concerns. Furthermore, no formal or informal relationship existed between the two geographically distant urban LEAs. Little, if any, collaboration had been practiced prior to Project CAUSE due to the lack of proximate LEAs with common problems. Moreover, the pre-CAUSE utilization of R&D solutions was at best minimal. Considering all these factors one begins to get a picture of the magnitude and ubiquitousness of con-

straints which posed the greatest challenge during project activities. These difficulties necessitated an alteration in the attitude and behavior of participants. That is, the Project had to begin from "ground zero" and find a way to get people to (1) practice collaboration in identifying and solving problems, and (2) consider RD&D as a vital, practical source of support for local improvement efforts.

Careful review of the major Project accomplishments presented on the charts in sections II, III, and IV which follow should provide the reader with convincing evidence that the CAUSE staff diligently maintained the Project's integrity and consistently adhered to the proposal. The Project met or exceeded most objectives and produced far greater benefits and improvements than anticipated. Sections V and VI provide additional insights into and implications for the development of viable collaborative relationships and/or the building of an LEA's capacity to make local improvements through the use of RD&D information.

II. Evidence Toward Attainment of Project Purposes

Purpose:

I. To increase the capacity of urban educators to use resources available through RD & D agencies and to strengthen their own internal RD & D capabilities

Indicators	Pre-CAUSE (Jan. - Dec. 1980)	At End of CAUSE Year 1 (Jan. 1981 - Feb. 1982)	At End of CAUSE Year 2 (Mar. 1982 - May 1983)
1. No. of requests (including customized searches) for RD & D filed with AIDS by individuals in LEA's	201 from Mobile 51 from Birmingham	110 from Mobile 90 from Birmingham	123 from Mobile 30 from Birmingham
2. No. of individuals from LEA's attending RD & D workshops	Totals: 247 individuals 61 schools SDE Sponsored 183 from Mobile 15 from Birmingham 45 local schools represented AEL Sponsored 6 from Mobile 3 from Birmingham 6 local schools represented	Totals: 812 individuals 174 local schools SDE Sponsored 265 from Mobile 187 from Birmingham 78 local schools represented AEL Sponsored 4 from Mobile 1 from Birmingham 5 local schools represented	Totals: 3,537 individuals 168 local schools SDE Sponsored 381 from Mobile 289 from Birmingham 94 local schools represented AEL Sponsored 102 from Mobile 62 from Birmingham 74 local schools represented

II. Evidence Toward Attainment of Project Purposes

Purpose:

Indicators	Pre-CAUSE (Jan. - Dec. 1980)	At End of CAUSE Year 1 (Jan. 1981 - Feb. 1982)	At End of CAUSE Year 2 (Mar. 1982 - May 1983)
	Mobile Sponsored	Mobile Sponsored	Mobile Sponsored
	40 from Mobile	343 from Mobile	1,371 from Mobile
	0 from Birmingham	12 from Birmingham	6 from Birmingham
	10 local schools represented	91 local schools represented	91 local schools represented
	Birmingham Sponsored	Birmingham Sponsored	Birmingham Sponsored
	0 from Mobile	0 from Mobile	2 from Mobile
	0 from Birmingham	0 from Birmingham	1,325 from Birmingham
	0 local schools represented	0 local schools represented	98 local schools represented
3. No. of schools using RD & D programs	16 in Mobile 3 in Birmingham	20 in Mobile 6 in Birmingham	26 in Mobile 14 in Birmingham
4. No. of individuals from local schools attending state conferences focusing on RD & D	4 from Mobile 15 from Birmingham	52 from Mobile 41 from Birmingham	21 in Mobile 27 from Birmingham

II. Evidence Toward Attainment of Project Purposes

Purpose:

Indicators	Pre-CAUSE (Jan. - Dec. 1980)	At End of CAUSE Year 1 (Jan. 1981 - Feb. 1982)	At End of CAUSE Year 2 (Mar. 1982 - May 1983)
5. No. of regional conferences focusing on RD & D attended by project staff/LEA personnel	3 Mobile 2 Birmingham 11 Staff	5 Mobile 3 Birmingham 7 Staff	14 Mobile 27 Birmingham 18 Staff
6. No. of national conferences focusing on RD & D attended by Project Staff/ LEA personnel	0 Mobile 0 Birmingham 1 Staff	0 Mobile 0 Birmingham 3 Staff	7 Mobile 4 Birmingham 1 Staff
7. No. of individuals in local schools requesting specific RD & D reports, documents, etc., from local project coordinators	N/A	236 in Mobile Not documented in Birmingham	784 in Mobile 6 in Birmingham
8. No. of individuals in local schools requesting specific RD & D program information from local coordinators	N/A	27 in Mobile Not documented in Birmingham	87 in Mobile 4 in Birmingham

II. Evidence Toward Attainment of Project Purposes

Purpose:

Indicators	Pre-CAUSE (Jan. - Dec. 1980)	At End of CAUSE Year 1 (Jan. 1981 - Feb. 1982)	At End of CAUSE Year 2 (Mar. 1982 - May 1983)
9. No. of individuals in local schools attending RD & D program awareness sessions			147 in Mobile 135 in Birmingham
10. No. of individuals in local schools attending RD & D information awareness sessions			218 in Mobile 158 in Birmingham
11. No. of individuals in local schools receiving technical assistance in the utilization of RD & D programs and/or information			318 in Mobile 36 in Birmingham

II. Evidence Toward Attainment of Project Purposes

Purpose:

Indicators	Pre-CAUSE (Jan. - Dec. 1980)	At End of CAUSE Year 1 (Jan. 1981 - Feb. 1982)	At End of CAUSE Year 2 (Mar. 1982 - May 1983)
5. No. of known exchanges of written materials program guides, books, etc., between individuals in Mobile and Birmingham	0 exchanges	16 exchanges	25 exchanges
6. No. of joint planning meetings including project staff members with individuals in LEAs and/or AEL	6 including Mobile 3 including Birmingham 3 including AEL	23 including Mobile 15 including Birmingham 3 including AEL	45 including Mobile 18 including Birmingham 10 including AEL
7. No. of documented telephone conferences between SDE project staff members and individuals in LEAs and AEL	0 with Mobile	Not documented, but made hundreds of calls with Mobile, Birmingham and AEL	Not documented, but made hundreds of calls with Mobile, Birmingham and AEL
8. No. of on-site visits to LEAs/AEL by SDE Project staff members	6 to Mobile 2 to Birmingham 1 to AEL	16 to Mobile 14 to Birmingham 4 to AEL	14 to Mobile 7 to Birmingham 14 to AEL

II. Evidence Toward Attainment of Project Purposes

Purpose:

II. To develop linkages between the systems and build upon linkages currently existing between SDE and other members to CAUSE (LEAs and AEL)

Indicators	Pre-CAUSE (Jan. - Dec. 1980)	At End of CAUSE Year 1 (Jan. 1981 - Feb. 1982)	At End of CAUSE Year 2 (Mar. 1982 - May 1983)
1. No. of joint planning meetings of individuals from Mobile and Birmingham	0 meetings 0 total individuals	9 meetings 31 total individuals	13 meetings 42 individuals
2. No. of documented telephone conferences between individuals from Mobile and Birmingham	0 calls	8 calls	26 calls
3. No. of individuals making on-site visits to other LEAs	0 visits 0 totai days 0 individuals	4 visits 8 total days 16 individuals	6 visits 50 total days 12 individuals
4. No. of known written communications between individuals from Mobile and Birmingham	0 communications	27 communications	41 communications

II. Evidence Toward Attainment of Project Purposes

Purpose:

Indicators	Pre-CAUSE (Jan. - Dec. 1980)	At End of CAUSE Year 1 (Jan. 1981 - Feb. 1982)	At End of CAUSE Year 2 (Mar. 1982 - May 1983)
5. No. of known exchanges of written materials program guides, books, etc., between individuals in Mobile and Birmingham	0 exchanges	16 exchanges	25 exchanges
6. No. of joint planning meetings including project staff members with individuals in LEAs and/or AEL	6 including Mobile 3 including Birmingham 3 including AEL	23 including Mobile 15 including Birmingham 3 including AEL	45 including Mobile 18 including Birmingham 10 including AEL
7. No. of documented telephone conferences between SDE project staff members and individuals in LEAs and AEL	0 with Mobile 0 with Birmingham 0 with AEL	Not documented, but made hundreds of calls with Mobile, Birmingham and AEL	Not documented, but made hundreds of calls with Mobile, Birmingham and AEL
8. No. of on-site visits to LEAs/AEL by SDE Project staff members	6 to Mobile 2 to Birmingham 1 to AEL	16 to Mobile 14 to Birmingham 4 to AEL	14 to Mobile 7 to Birmingham 10 to AEL

13

II. Evidence Toward Attainment of Project Purposes

Purpose:

Indicators	Pre-CAUSE (Jan. - Dec. 1980)	At End of CAUSE Year 1 (Jan. 1981 - Feb. 1982)	At End of CAUSE Year 2 (Mar. 1982 - May 1983)
9. No. of written communications from SDE project staff members to individuals in LEAs and AEL	3 to Mobile 2 to Birmingham 2 to AEL	16 to Mobile 9 to Birmingham 8 to AEL	24 to Mobile 7 to Birmingham 14 to AEL
10. No. of documents (other than customized searches) exchanged with individuals in LEAs by SDE Project staff	61 with Mobile 87 with Birmingham	363 with Mobile 185 with Birmingham	7,508 with Mobile 60 with Birmingham
11. No. of conferences and/or workshops attended by SDE project staff members involving individuals from LEAs and/or AEL	17 conferences/workshops 34 staff members attending 64½ total number of days	31 conferences/workshops 57 staff members attending 108 total workshop days	71 conferences/workshops 85 staff members attending 97 total workshop days
12. No. copies RD & D materials provided workshop participants by SDE Project staff	? Mobile ? Birmingham	1208 Mobile 540 Birmingham	510 Mobile 112 Birmingham (est.)

II. Evidence Toward Attainment of Project Purposes

Purpose: .

Indicators	Pre-CAUSE (Jan. - Dec. 1980)	At End of CAUSE Year 1 (Jan. 1981 - Feb. 1982)	At End of CAUSE Year 2 (Mar. 1982 - May 1983)
the LEAs		* Synthesis process used in the follow-up conference as well as in the Superintendent's Athletic Committee	
15. No. of times needs assessment processes have been documented for dissemination	0 in Mobile 0 in Birmingham	3 in Mobile 1 in Birmingham	8 in Mobile 1 in Birmingham
16. No. of times needs systhesis processes have been documented for dissemination	0 in Mobile 0 in Birmingham	2 in Mobile 0 in Birmingham 1 joint	3 in Mobile 0 in Birmingham
17. No. of outside resources (human and programs/ practices) identifies, evaluated and documented for future dissemination and utilization	0 in Mobile 0 in Birmingham	3 in Mobile 3 in Birmingham 96 in SDE	5 in Mobile 3 in Birmingham

II. Evidence Toward Attainment of Project Purposes

Purpose:

Indicators	Pre-CAUSE (Jan. - Dec. 1980)	At End of CAUSE Year 1 (Jan. 1981 - Feb. 1982)	At End of CAUSE Year 2 (Mar. 1982 - May 1983)
13. No. of linkages developed by LEAs with non-members of the collaborative			Mobile 41 businesses 8 churches/civic organizations 3 colleges/universities 13 others Birmingham 28 businesses 14 churches/civic organizations 6 colleges/universities 7 others
14. No. of times a systematic process has been used to synthesize common-shared needs with others within	0 in Mobile 0 in Birmigham	2 in Mobile * 0 in Birmingham	5 in Mobile 1 in Birmingham

13.

II. Evidence Toward Attainment of Project Purposes

Purpose:

Indicators	Pre-CAUSE (Jan. - Dec. 1980)	At End of CAUSE Year 1 (Jan. 1981 - Feb. 1982)	At End of CAUSE Year 2 (Mar. 1982 - May 1983)
18. No. of times individual assessments of and re-actions to a wide variety of resources addressing a single problem area have been documented for dissemination	0 in Mobile 0 in Birmingham 0 jointly	0 in Mobile 0 in Birmingham 1 jointly	1 in Mobile 0 in Birmingham 0 jointly

II. Evidence Toward Attainment of Project Purposes

Purpose:

III. To constitute a collaborative that is viable and effective in serving the needs of its members and can serve as a model for others

Indicators	Pre-CAUSE (Jan. - Dec. 1980)	At End of CAUSE Year 1 (Jan. 1981 - Feb. 1982)	At End of CAUSE Year 2 (Mar. 1982 - May 1983)
1. No. of individuals from SDE, LEAs, and AEL serving on a joint council	N/A	1 from AEL 2 from SDE 3 from Mobile 3 from Birmingham	1 from AEL 7 from SDE 7 from Mobile 7 from Birmingham
2. No. of individuals from SDE, LEAs, serving ½ time (or more) on joint project efforts	N/A	2 from SDE 1 from Mobile 1 from Birmingham	2 from SDE 1 from Mobile 1 from Birmingham
3. No. of individuals from local schools and LEAs serving on System Advisory Council	N/A	N/A	9 in Mobile 7 in Birmingham
4. No. of individuals from local schools serving on Local School Project Committees	N/A	N/A	Mobile 8 Dickson 9 Hillsdale 7 Shaw

II. Evidence Toward Attainment of Project Purposes

Purpose:

Indicators	Pre-CAUSE (Jan. - Dec. 1980)	At End of CAUSE Year 1 (Jan. 1981 - Feb. 1982)	At End of CAUSE Year 2 (Mar. 1982 - May 1983)
			Birmingham 8 Phillips 9 Tuggle 8 Egan 6 Jones Valey 7 Central Park
5. No. of project planning sessions held involving SDE and LEAs	N/A	23 sessions 74 days total	17 sessions 24 days total
6. No. of awareness/ orientation sessions held addressing urban education concerns	0 in Mobile 0 in Birmingham	12 in Mobile 3 in Birmingham	3 in Mobile 4 in Birmingham
7. No. of activities/events sponsored by project	N/A	95 total activities/events 2 local N.A. conferences	239 total activities/events 8 Needs clarification meetings/conferences

II. Evidence Toward Attainment of Project Purposes

Purpose:

Indicators	Pre-CAUSE (Jan. - Dec. 1980)	At End of CAUSE Year 1 (Jan. 1981 - Feb. 1982)	At End of CAUSE Year 2 (Mar. 1982 - May 1983)
		1 needs validation activity (mail-out involving 250 from each LEA	7 meetings with pilot school principals
		26 project awareness activities: • video and/or slide tape presentations • on-site presentations made by local coordinators • newsletters	15 project awareness sessions: • faculty meetings • PTA meetings • Civic Club presentations • newsletters
		12 Information Exchange Bank awareness sessions	21 Information Bank Awareness sessions
		1 Needs systhesis seminar	
		3 Policy Council meetings	3 Policy Council meetings

II. Evidence Toward Attainment of Project Purposes

Purpose:

Indicators	Pre-CAUSE (Jan. - Dec. 1980)	At End of CAUSE Year 1 (Jan. 1981 - Feb. 1982)	At End of CAUSE Year 2 (Mar. 1982 - May 1983)
10. No. of incidences where LEAs have contributed human resources to aid other LEAs	1 by Mobile 0 by Birmingham	23 by Mobile 7 by Birmingham	6 by Mobile 7 by Birmingham
11. No. of occasions where activities exclusively addressing urban educational problems have been held in LEAs	0 in Mobile 0 in Birmingham	23 in Mobile 12 in Birmingham	68 in Mobile 45 in Birmingham
12. No. of times a systematic process has been used to identify needs in LEAs utilizing a broad-based committee of school personnel, parents, and community representatives	0 by Mobile 0 by Birmingham	4 by Mobile* 1 by Birmingham * The Superintendent has used the DAP model with 3 advisory committees since the CAUSE N.A. conference	17 by Mobile 1 by Birmingham
13. No. of times a systematic process has been used to synthesize common-shared needs with another	0 in Mobile 0 in Birmingham	3 in Mobile* 1 in Birmingham	15 in Mobile 1 in Birmingham

II. Evidence Toward Attainment of Project Purposes

Purpose:

Indicators	Pre-CAUSE (Jan. - Dec. 1980)	At End of CAUSE Year 1 (Jan. 1981 - Feb. 1982)	At End of CAUSE Year 2 (Mar. 1982 - May 1983)
LEA in state		* Synthesis process model has been used in Superintendent's committees twice	

II. Evidence Toward Attainment of Project Purposes

Purpose:

IV. To Establish a collaborative, develop linkages between its members, and increase RD & D utilization and capacities as a means of improving educational policies and practices and increasing equity within member agencies

Indicators	Pre-CAUSE (Jan. - Dec. 1980)	At End of CAUSE Year 1 (Jan. 1981 - Feb. 1982)	At End of CAUSE Year 2 (Mar. 1982 - May 1983)
1. No. of needed policy proposals identified in synthesis by "multi-role" action group involving parents, community/ business representatives, principals, teachers, central office staff	N/A	5 common/shared 16 Mobile specific 0 Birmingham specific	No additions in 2nd year
2. No. of policy proposals written and processed by "multi-role" action group	N/A	1 common/shared 6 Mobile specific 0 Birmingham specific	No additions in 2nd year
3. No. of "multi-role" action committees continuing work on system specific policy proposals	N/A	4 in Mobile 31 individuals involved 0 in Birmingham 0 individuals involved	No additions in 2nd year

II. Evidence Toward Attainment of Project Purposes

Purpose:

Indicators	Pre-CAUSE (Jan. - Dec. 1980)	At End of CAUSE Year 1 (Jan. 1981 - Feb. 1982)	At End of CAUSE Year 2 (Mar. 1982 - May 1983)
4. No. of new programs/ practices reviewed by "multi-role" committees in LEA	N/A	18 in Mobile 18 in Birmingham	5 in Mobile 35 in Birmingham
5. No. of new programs/ practices adopted/adapted as a result of "multi-role" committee recommendations	N/A	2 in Mobile 2 in Birmingham	26 in Mobile 29 in Birmingham
6. No. of new programs/ practices being seriously considered for adoption/adaption as a result of "multi-role" committee recommendations	N/A	4 in Mobile 3 in Birmingham	3 in Mobile 8 in Birmingham
7. No. of schools involved in improvement programs as a direct result of CAUSE			7 in Mobile 16 in Birmingham

II. Evidence Toward Attainment of Project Purposes

Purpose:

Indicators	Pre-CAUSE (Jan. - Dec. 1980)	At End of CAUSE Year 1 (Jan. 1981 - Feb. 1982)	At End of CAUSE Year 2 (Mar. 1982 - May 1983)
8. No. of schools involved in improvement activities as an indirect result of CAUSE			85 in Mobile 98 in Birmingham
9. No. of individuals within schools directly involved in improvement efforts as a result of CAUSE			386 in Mobile 193 in Birmingham
10. No. of individuals from the community directly involved in school improvement efforts as a result of CAUSE			307 in Mobile 148 in Birmingham
11. Percent of blacks included in project leadership positions (equity)	N/A	0% on Project staff 44% Policy Council 38% Project participants	0% on Project staff 40% on Policy Council 42% Project participants

II. Evidence Toward Attainment of Project Purposes

Purpose:

Indicators	Pre-CAUSE (Jan. - Dec. 1980)	At End of CAUSE Year 1 (Jan. 1981 - Feb. 1982)	At End of CAUSE Year 2 (Mar. 1982 - May 1983)
12. Percent of women included in project leadership positions (equity)	N/A	75% Project staff 22% Policy Council 53% Project participants	50% Project staff 20% Policy Council 53% Project participants
13. Percent of blacks participating in local school improvement efforts			48% in Mobile 81% in Birmingham
14. Percent of women participating in local school improvement efforts			57% in Mobile 65% in Birmingham
15. Percent of specific needs identified which address equity issues	N/A	6 "handicapped students" 6 "disadvantaged students" 0 "racial discrimination" 0 "sex discrimination"	All local school projects focused on school-community problems which greatly involve equity issues

25

II. Evidence Toward Attainment of Project Purposes

Purpose:

Indicators	Pre-CAUSE (Jan. - Dec. 1980)	At End of CAUSE Year 1 (Jan. 1981 - Feb. 1982)	At End of CAUSE Year 2 (Mar. 1982 - May 1983)
		3 discrimination against "urban education"	
16. Percent of specific needs addressing equity issues presently being acted upon	N/A	2 jointly 7 in Mobile only 1 in Birmingham only	0 jointly 5 in Mobile only 8 in Birmingham only

III.A Accomplished Objectives and Outcomes - Planning Year

1.0 Organize for collaboration

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
A. Project office/staffing (1.a, 1.b)*	4 professionals ½ time plus additional time allowed by SDE and LEAs (see Section IV for time utilization) 18 collaborators trained in D.A.P. needs assessment process 16 LEA facilitators 2 local coordinators	• Collaborative planning • No unilateral action • Shared responsibilities	• Direct communication on all matters presented • Joint planning of activities • Expanded perception of special considerations, needs, procedures, etc., to be considered	• Geographic distance • Costs • Personnel changes • Time required to establish working relationships and rapport
B. Establish and operate Policy Council (P.C.) (1.c, 1.d, 1.e, 1.f, 1.g)*	Composition: 3 Birmingham 3 Mobile 3 SDE 3 AEL 3 meetings Average attendance 8 members 6 staff/observers	• Shared decision making and responsibility practiced by P.C. members • Members developed common interest in a significant, well-defined goal • Fostered strong, unwaivering individual and organizational commitment of time, personnel and resources guaranteeing sense of ownership and continuing interest	• Sense of ownership • Improved communications • Input from various levels • Common understanding • Mutual trust and spirit of cooperation	• Meetings expensive due to geographic distance • Difficulties in arranging meeting times to accommodate individual member's schedule
C. Establish and operate communications network (1.h)*	33 memos from Project 25 memos from local coordinator 8 Birmingham 17 Mobile Hundreds of phone calls including calls between •Project office and local coordinators	• Frequent formal and informal communication • Much direct face-to-face (interfacing) • Numerous phone calls ensured direct and correct transmittal of information	• Established personal "lasting" interaction between individuals • Encourage frequent exchange of needs and information among participants	• Postage • Long-distance charges • Correspondence and phone call calls not always as effective as personal (face-to-face) contact

*Cross referenced to specific objectives in original proposal

III.A Accomplished Objectives and Outcomes - Planning Year

1.0 Organize for collaboration (continued)

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
	• Local coordinators • Coordinators and local participants • Project office and local participants • Participants (Mobile) and participants (Birmingham) • Project staff and AEL			
D. Recruitment and involvement (1.j, 1.k, 1.l, 1.m, 1.n, 1.o, 1.p, 1.q, 1.r)*	16 pilot schools 97 individuals by role 32 parents 32 teachers 16 principals 10 central office 6 community/business 1 Board of Education	• High interest leading to expansion of number of pilot schools (from six to nine) • Large representative group directly involved and informed	• Allowed selectivity in choosing pilot schools • Led to early decision by individuals as to level of interest/commitment • Involved specific individuals early in project • Establish early and direct communication between staff and participants (no danger of breakdown in communicatiosn) • Established high level of visibility and identity with project	

III.A Accomplished Objectives and Outcomes - Planning Year

2.0 Identify/assess shared and system-specific educational needs

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
A. Recruitment and orientation of participants (2.a, 1.b)*	18 key people trained to facilitate needs assessment (NA) process (D.A.P. model) 352 orientated to needs identification process to be used 92 participants 250 validators 10 central office	• Guaranteed replication of NA process in both systems	• Expanded awareness of project purposes and goals • Led to thorough understanding of project purposes and NA process by key individuals • Clarified roles and responsibilities of all facilitators, participants, and validators	
B. Identification, analysis and synthesis of needs (2.c, 2.d, 2.e, 2.f, 2.g, 2.h, 2.i, 2.j, 2.k)*	92 participants in NA conference 50 Birmingham 42 Mobile 248 needs identified 140 Birmingham 108 Mobile	• Involvement of individuals from all role groups • Lists of validated needs for each LEA • Written reports of NA outcomes in each system provided to those in leadership positions	• Widespread input/involvement from large number of individuals representative of school and community • Face-to-face interaction between key participants in LEAs	• Insufficient funding limited NA and synthesis conferences to one day each (two days needed for each conference for maximum benefits)
	250 participants in validation (Mobile) 24 participants in synthesis seminar (by role) 6 central office 4 principals 2 community/business 6 teachers 6 parents 15 common/shared needs identified in synthesis seminar 181 system/specific needs identified in synthesis seminar	• Lists of common/shared needs prioritized jointly by group representing both LEAs • A list of system-specific needs for each LEA • A workable needs synthesis process enabling a group to analyze/compare/combine/prioritize a list of needs • A written report of synth synthesis findings and recommendations	• Development of cohesive action group in LEAs • Knowledge of validated needs allowing LEAs to plan local system improvement efforts • Intra-system interaction among role-alike individuals	• Schedule and design placed extremely heavy demands on Project staff

*Cross referenced to specific objectives in original proposal

III.A Accomplished Objectives and Outcomes - Planning Year

3.0 Assess a variety of resources that can be utilized in generating alternative solutions to identified priority needs

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
A. Select needs and identify resources for potential solutions (3.a, 3.b, 3.c, 3.d)*	4 priority common/shared need areas selected Resources explored: • Print: - 26 computer searches in four need areas conducted and reproduced for dissemination - All presenters invited to display/exhibit materials - Other appropriate RD & D materials reproduced by staff and disseminated • Programs/practices 48 considered (NDN, LEA, AEL, R & D centers, other agencies) • Human 85 individual resource persons screened • Financial support (other than from CAUSE budget) Birmingham and Mobile school systems Alabama Department of Education	• Consensus of P.C. on following focal areas to be addressed: • "Teacher Effectiveness" • "Teacher Morale" • "Career/Vocational Counseling/Guidance" • "Public Relations/ Community and Parental Involvement" • A variety of resources (human, print, programs/ practices, etc.) explored including: • State-of-the-art/science • Exemplary/validated programs • Successful programs and practices from within the collaborating agencies • Interaction panels using key individuals within the state • Established "pool" of resources from which to select most appropriate "match" between priority needs and promising solutions • Computer searches in four focal areas reviewed by staff members and selected references disseminated	• A wide variety of potential problem-solving resources available within four focal areas • Staff members from LEAs learned a great deal about agencies and individuals in the area of RD & D who can provide resources to meet local needs • LEAs conducted in-depth exploration of their own resources in four areas • Knowledge of current research available from individuals in LEAs on continuing basis beyond conference setting	• Identification and selection of resources difficult and time consuming • Process of identifying, contracting, negotiating and scheduling very time consuming

54

55

*Cross referenced to specific objectives in original proposal

III.A Accomplished Ob'ectives and Outcomes - Planning Year

3.0 Assess a variety of resources that can be utilized in generating alternative solutions to identified priority needs (continued)

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
	AEL			
	TAB/MDN			
	Alabama Facilitator Project			
	MDN D/Ds			
	National School Resource Network			
	ERIC Clearinghouse			
	Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement			
	National Institute of Education			
	State institutions of higher education			
	News media			
	State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee			
	State Planning Office			
	Institute for Urban and Minority Education			
	Desegregation Assistance Center (Miami)			
	CEMREL			
	Other Alabama school systems			
	R & D centers			
	National School Public Relations Association			

3.0 Assess a variety of resources that can be utilized in generating alternative solutions to identified priority needs (continued)

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
	Independent R & D agencies Out-of-state colleges and universities			
B. Design, schedule and implement resource conference (3.e, 3.f, 3.g, 3.h)*	2½ day conference organized around 4 focal areas involving 61 individuals conducting sessions during which 29 different programs/practices were presented 18,950 estimated value of financial and/or human resources contributed by agencies other than collaborative members 8 resource assessment teams (RATs) meeting for participants 2 role-alike interaction sessions for participants 16 displays/exhibits 144 total conference participants (by agency) 73 collaborating school systems 11 other school systems 22 State Department of Education 5 Appalachia Educational Laboratory 25 other agencies/ organizations 8 institutions of higher education	• Exceptionally well-designed conference incorporated the three major recommendations of the Policy Council: That a variety of alternative solutions/ resources be featured addressing each of the four priority areas That a high degree of participant involvement be assured That maximum opportunity for participant interaction be provided and encouraged	• Participants were actively involved with and directly exposed to a wide variety of resources which addressed their specific concerns/problems • A strong sense of ownership of the Project and responsibility for its success was developed in participants • New professional relationships between participants were initiated leading to further communications and exchanges of information	• There was not enough time for sufficient interaction between participants and consultants (more time needed to internalize information and to formulate questions • Schedule was extremely "tight" and demanding for participants and staff

*Cross referenced to specific objectives in original proposal

58

3.0 Assess a variety of resources that can be utilized in generating alternative solutions to identified priority needs (continued)

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
C. Conference data compilation/analysis, reporting and follow-up (3.i, 3.j, 3.k, 3.l)*	435 total individual "presentation assessment" sheets compiled 362 total "resource reaction" sheets compiled 96 total "role-alike" response to resource sheets compiled 55 total "conference" evaluation sheets compiled	• Complete compilation of individual assessments regarding potential application and utilization of alternative resources prepared • Complete compilation of role-alike response to resources prepared • Complete compilation of participants' evaluation of resource conference prepared • Detailed report of resource conference written and presented to P. C. members • Follow-up report of resource converence outcomes written and sent to participants	• Data collected at various points during the conference provided a sound basis for decision making and planning specifically concerning utilization of various RD & D resources	• The compilation and analysis of data resulting from conference was very time consuming (greatly exceeded allotted time initailly planned)

*Cross referenced to specific objectives in original proposal

III.A Accomplished Objectives and Outcomes - Planning Year

4.0 Decide upon substantive issues

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
A. Developing and approving substantive agenda for 1982 (4.a, 4.b, 4.c)*	3 levels of selection criteria approved 10 proposed goals ranked 39 proposed objectives ranked Two-day P.C. meeting attended by: 9 participants 4 staff members 3 observers	• A list of proposed goals and agenda items developed for consideration • A list of criteria developed for selecting project's 1982 focus • A list of criteria developed for selecting project's 1982 goals • A list of criteria developed for selecting project's 1982 objectives • Fianl decision make on substantive agenda for 1982 by P.C.	• Increased community/ business interest as evidenced by inclusion of Chamber of Commerce in both LEAs as Collaborative member in year two. • Informed and orderly decisions made by P.C. members providing basis for planning 1982 year of implementation • Renewed commitment to continuation of Project by P.C. • Positive attitudes demonstrated by P. C. members • Solidified support of individual P.C. members and collaborating agencies	

*Cross referenced to specific objectives in original proposal

5.0 Prepare operational plan

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
A. Evaluate, document P.C. actions, interactions, attitudes (4.a, 5.e, 5.f)*	1 evaluation instrument for measuring incentives and disincentives for collaboration 3 summaries of participant's evaluation of incentives and disincentives for collaboration 1 attitudinal change report summary prepared 3 P.C. meetings documented in AEL history 1 summary of each P.C. meeting written by project staff (total of 3)	• Specific data on participant's attitudes toward collaboration gathered and documented • Specific data on attitudinal development change in participants as planning progressed and collaborative developed • Provided a practical guide to staff for building additional incentives to operational plan for year 2		• AEL history and accounts were not provided until after all plans for operational year had been completed, resulting in loss of anticipated benefits
B. Design governance and management plan for year 2 (5.g, 5.h, 5.i)*	2 LEA Advisory Committees 16 LEA Project Committees 2 additional collaborative members added (currently 13 members)	• Recommendations reported to P.C. • Discussion held • Concurrence reached on structure and plan for year two	• Staff was given clear directions on modifications of governance structure desired • Each P.C. member made a statement of continued commitment to the governance design and of chair desire to continue as a P.C. member	
C. Develop operational plan (5.b, 5.c, 5.d, 5.e, 5.h, 5.h, 5.i, 5.j)*	Plan includes: 5 project purposes 6 project goals 4 program focus areas 56 specific objectives 6-8 local conferences 3 joint conferences	• A well developed second year plan which provides for the organization/governance/management/implementation of year two activities/programs, which reflect the identified needs of the LEAs, and the continuation/documentation/dissemination thereof	• Continued support for project from collaborative members due to high level of input and involvement in planning and designing operational plan • Continued interest and support for the concept of collaboration resulting from incentives provided in the plan	

*Cross referenced to specific objectives in original proposal

III.A Accomplished Objectives and Outcomes - Planning Year

5.0 Prepare operational plan (continued)

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
	Numerous meetings, work sessions, work-shops Needed guidelines/ criteria Budgets Etc.			

III.A Accomplished Objectives and Outcomes - Planning Year

6.0 Execute a subcontract with AEL to prepare a written history

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
A. Complete contractual arrangements with AEL (6.a)*	Subcontract prepared and signed	• Written agreement outlining AEL's responsibility and product to be delivered		
B. Provide logistical support to AEL staff (6.b)*	Large number of CAUSE staff person days devoted to planning, documenting, writing, critiquing... history prepared by AEL	• Cooperative development enhances likelihood that history will be a complete and accurate portrayal of the year's important events		• Communication • Staff assignment • Time lines (delays)

*Cross referenced to specific objectives in original proposal

63

63

III.B Accomplished Objectives and Ourcomes - Implementation Year

1.0 Refine/strengthen/provide for institutionalization of governance, operation and management of the Collaborative.

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
A. Reorganize Central Project Organization Structure • Office and staff (1.a, 1.b) • Policy Council (1.c, 1.d, 1.e)	1½ time Project Director in Mobile 1½ time Project Manager in Montgomery 2½ time Project Coordinators (1-Birmingham & 1-Mobile) 2 staff members met with Project Officer and 4 NIE staff members 3 project staff meetings 2 Chamber of Commerce representatives added to Policy Council 2 Policy Council meetings held 3 Birmingham 3 Mobile 2 SDE 1 AEL 2 Chambers of Commers	• Changing position of Project Director to LEA from SDE • Maintaining position of Project Manager in SDE. • Obtaining commitment for half-time Local Coordinators from each LEA • Addition of Chambers of Commerce in LEA areas as members in Collaborative • Modification of project timeline from 12 months to 16 months • reorganization meeting of Policy Council (including new members) held • Concurrence secured on project design and implementation activities plan • informal meeting held with new NIE Project officers and staff members • meeting of project staff in Mobile • Meeting of project staff in Birmingham • Meeting of project staff in Montgomery • Meeting of Policy Council in Montgomery	• Individual and agency commitment to the Collaborative was strong enough to withstand all frustrations and time losses involved with reorganization • Substantial support for the newly initiated input and governance structure by individuals and agencies • LEA's willingness to provide Local Coordinators to operate and manage project even though the funding level is inadequate to assist with their salaries • Chamber of Commerce personnel willing to participate in the many meetings necessary to maintain continual personal contact with other project members • Concurrence among members of Collaborative to extend timelines rather than reduce activities planned • Decisions made on procedures for submitting, approving and disbursing mini-grant and matching grant monies to local pilot schools and to LEAs	• Loss of time in "getting started" due to personnel and role changes • Difficulty in getting approval from NIE resulted in loss of momentum in early months of implementation

III.B Accomplished Objectives and Ourcomes - Implementation Year

1.0 Refine/strengthen/provide for institutionalization of governance, operation and management of the Collaborative (continued)

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
			• Project has maintained its formal identity through this period of decentralized activities • The project's operational structure (Policy Council, Advisory Committees, Local Project Committees) has proven itself to be effective	
B. Specify communications needs and design communications network (1.f)	Much person-to-person communication numerous letters, memos, phone calls, etc.	• Modification of project communication system • Project newsletter disseminated • Utilization of the collaborative's communication system -- formal (newsletter, memos, etc.) -- informal (face-to-face, telephone calls, etc.)	• Approval of the more direct person-to-person communication system rather than the traditional agency-to-agency mode • Increased communication between individual representatives to the collaborative both in formal and informal settings • Communication lines have remained open with frequent exchanges • staff members have gained valuable first hand information about the day-to-day workings of both LEAs and SDE	• Communication gaps resulting from position changes

III.B Accomplished Objectives and Ourcomes - Implementation Year

I.0 Refine/strengthen/provide for institutionalization of governance, operation and management of the Collaborative (continued)

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
C. Form and Orientate Committees • Pilot school project committees (1.g, 1.h, 1.k, 1.l) • Advisory Committee (1.i, 1.j, 1.m, 1.n)	8 Local School Project committees 61 total numbers 2 System Advisory Committees 7 members - Birmingham 9 members - Mobile 48 Local school project committee meetings 10 system advisory committee meetings	• Initiation of a local school and local school system governance structures • Organization, orientation, and initial work sessions of Local School Project Committees held • Organization and orientation meetings of LEA's Advisory Committees held • LEA's Advisory Committees met and made final decisions on local school Problem Analysis Conferences • Update sessions for LEA's central office administrators held • Monthly meetings of LEA's Advisory Committees for exchange of information on accomplishments and needs	• Involvement of additional local school people in planning and decision making process through Local School Project Committees and LEA's Advisory Committees • Shift of "power" from central body (Policy Council) to local bodies (Advisory Committees) increasing the institutionalization of collaborative concept • Allowed major decisions to be made at local system level and key operational decisions to occur at local school level • Reduced need for costly Policy Council meetings	
D. Determine and communicate each schools' commitment to continue (1.o, 1.p)	18 schools responded to "commitment to continue" worksheet 8 pilot schools selected - 5 Birmingham - 3 Mobile	• LEA's Advisory Committees met and reviewed applications from potential pilot schools and final selections made • 2nd year pilot schools selected • 2nd year pilot schools notified of acceptance	• Increased interest and active involvement of "grass roots" people evidenced in evaluations of collaborative • The development of outward feelingsof "ownership" evidenced in representatives from local pilot schools	

III.B Accomplished Objectives and Outcomes - Implementation Year

9.0 Refine/strengthen/provide for institutionalization of governance, operation and management of the Collaborative (continued)

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
			• Selection process used by advisory committees ensured that only those schools strongly committed would continue	

III.B Accomplished Objectives and Outcomes - Implementation Year

2.0 Build an information bank/resource file

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
A. Refine and expand (2.a, 2.b)	4 categories established (one for each topical area) for securing and indexing information 1 personal computer acquired 1 part-time clerical person employed 1 person trained as resource center coordinator 258 information packages (indexed using ERIC descriptors) entered in computerized data bank and immediately available in resource center 1272 additional articles/ documents in print or microfiche form indexed, entered in databank and immediately available Thousands of additional articles and documents have been secured and will be entered in database Original categories (4 (4 topical areas) expanded to include other relevant topics identified by users and staff	• New search for resources to be filed in information exchange bank initiated • A plan for surveying LEA's for available human resources was initaited • Established specialized resource bank in Mobile to address specific needs of CAUSE • Personal computer acquired enabling computerization of data base for quick identification, location and retrieval of print resources • Provision by project manager's office to duplicate copies of all existing print materials specifically addressing CAUSE priority areas • Identification and acquisition by Project Director of additional relevant materials • Loan of microfiche reader by SDE to LEA for use in resource center	• LEAs are studying the use of computers for storing Resource Bank information • SDE staff members writing a proposal to secure computer for storing Resource Bank information • Local project coordinators' commitment to role of "linker" for research information to local school personnel has strengthened	• Preliminary screening of available information was difficult and time-consuming • Necessary synthesis of information to provide practical free and useful articles required great amount of time and other resources • Limited funding prohibited implementation of several planned, essential activities which would have enabled establishment of a comprehensive local resource center designed to more adequately meet needs of users

2.0 Build an information bank/resource file

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
B. Develop plan for description of holdings and utilization of resource file (2.c, 2.d, 2.e)	153 requests for customized searches 790 requests for RD&D information supplied by local coordinators 6 Birmingham 784 Mobile 91 requests for specific RD & D program information 4 Birmingham 87 Mobile 376 members attended information provision awareness sessions 158 Birmingham 218 Mobile	• A temporary (trial) system for indexing resource holdings developed • Various methods of describing resource file holdings explored • Description of selected resource holdings included in 2nd newsletter • Initial organization and indexing of resources identified in year one • Increase in the number of research information requests being initiated in LEA's • A plan for describing resource file holdings is being developed • Resource bank newsletter format design has been completed • Technical assistance provided by SDE to LEA CAUSE staff for organization and utilization of resource bank • Part-time clerical person employed and trained to operate resource bank • Resource bank orientation sessions held for pilot school personnel	• The use of existing sources of information (ERIC, etc.) has greatly increased • Frequency of requests for assistance by local coordinators from SDE and AEL members has increased • Technical assistance provided by SDE staff members to LEA coordinators and personnel enabled them to develop understanding of information sources, means of screening information, and practical ways of indexing storing and retrieving • Employment of part-time clerical person made possible through project mini grant • Location of resource bank and use of microcomputer reduced turn-around time and cost in responding to information needs of members • Increase in understanding of information available and interest in its utilization • Frequency of use increased when information was readily available without delay in the local CAUSE office	• Securing information on locally held resources very difficult due to time involved in writing descriptions and documenting • Outside search for existing models of the desired "resource bank" has not proven fruitful

III.B Accomplished Objectives and Ourcomes - Implementation Year

2.0 Build an information bank/resource file

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
		• Established cooperative relationship with University of South Alabama for utilization of library	• Project staff gained better understanding of user preferences, attitudes, behavior, etc. regarding information utilization	

III.B Accomplished Objectives and Ourcomes - Implementation Year

3.0 Analyze, refine and specify problem(s) to be addressed in each participating school

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
A. Develop and use problem analysis process in each school (3.a, 3.b)	1 needs clarification process developed 8 needs clarification conferences scheduled 2 needs clarification process orientation meetings held	• Plans for problem analysis process have been developed • Tentative plans and schedule for Local School Problem Analysis Conferences have been made • Problem analysis process (Needs Clarification Conferences) designed by staff • Local school leadership personnel oriented to Needs Clarification Conference process by local coordinators • Participant group for each of the conferences secured in pilot schools • Needs Clarification Conferences held in each of the pilot schools (5 in Birmingham, 3 in Mobile)	• Project staff is reviewing plans closely to study possibilities of redesigning process • A clear problem statement was produced in each pilot school • The indepth exploration of the problem brought to light many aspects which might have been overlooked in a less involved analysis • The analysis of the problem included varied points of view from several different perspectives	• In several cases the principal in the pilot school had established priorities for their school improvement efforts prior to conferences and as a result, were concerned that the conference group established other priorities • Concerns expressed by NIE staff as to the time constraints of the planned process
B. Inventory resources and identify alternative solutions (3.c)	4 staff members spent numerous hours identifying and reviewing specific resources for pilot school use	• Review of resources available to address specific needs identified in local conferences initiated by staff members • Each pilot school received specify TA in identifying both internal and external	• Many viable resources have been identified which address the needs of the local schools plans • Frequent interaction has taken place between the project staff members and local school committee members providing for many	

III.B Accomplished Objectives and Ourcomes - Implementation Year

3.0 Analyze, refine and specify problem(s) to be addressed in each participating school (continued)

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
	36 resource exploration sessions held in LEAs	resources which offered potential solutions	exchanges of valuable information	
	5 new programs reviewed in LEAs	• Multiple brain-storming sessions held during local school Project Committee meetings, advisory committee sessions, joint conference, etc., produced many ideas and helpful suggestions leading to location of additional resources	• A great deal of interest and enthusiasm was shown in recent meetings, by pilot school principals, for local conferences • Identification of resources which address specific needs of local school and school system improvement projects continued • During TA sessions, Project staff provided local schools with inforamtion and instruction relative to methods and procedures effective in utilizing internal resources and in acquiring outside resourc resources	
C. Plan action and implementation schedule (3.d)	8 action plans designed 8 mini/matching grant proposals written and submitted	• Action plans designed and implemented by each pilot school	• Practical activities have been planned to meet the objectives/goals of the improvement plans	
	Many TA sessions held in each pilot school	• Mini and matching grant proposals developed and submitted • TA provided each pilot school in development of action plan and implementation schedule	• Pilot schools are utilizing new resources which were previously untapped • Many community businesses and organizations are becoming involved with pilot school programs	

III.B Accomplished Objectives and Ourcomes - Implementation Year

3.0 Analyze, refine and specify problem(s) to be addressed in each participating school (continued)

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
			• Meetings of Local School Project Committees held to develop action agendas and timelines for pilot schools • Technical assistance sessions held with project staff members and local school project committees/pilot principals/local school faculties to aid in developing and implementing improvement plans • Workshop series held in Mobile for pilot school planning teams to instruct them in sound procedures to follow in designing and implementing school improvement programs	
D. Communicate results of above activities (3.e)	8 summaries written by pilot schools of Needs Clarification outcomes and reviewed by project leadership	• Summary of outcomes of each local school conference written by Local School Project Committees • Summaries of conference outcomes reviewed by Local Advisory Committee members, Local Coordinators, and staff members • Search for adjunct resources which offer alternative solutions to specific identified problems initiated	• General outlines and specific details about local school plans communicated to members of collaborative both formally and informally	

III.B Accomplished Objectives and Ourcomes - Implementation Year

4.0 Design and test mechanisms for effecting collaborative exchange leading to specific problem solution(s)

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
A. Develop plan for maximizing collaborative approach in meeting needs of individual schools (4.a., 4.b, 4.c, 4.d, 4.i)	7 meetings held with pilot school principals to develop plans for joint usage of resources and pooling of finances 4 advisory committee meetings held to share specific resource needs and information on resources identified for use Many staff meetings held to collaborate on joint usages of common needed resources 5 workshops held including a total of 98 participant days	• Awareness/orientation sessions held in LEAs to communicate specific information on project design and procedures for securing support and funds • Complete packets of materials including requirements for continuing in Collaborative, receiving funding, etc. were developed and distributed to key project participants form Year 1 • 5-day workshop series planned (to be held 3rd quarter) to assist local schools in developing and implementing their improvement plans (see attachment "A") • Exploration of "outside" resources which offer potential solutions for identified local school problems continued • A profile of each pilot schoo 's problem statement/needs reviewed by key members of the collaborative • Further identification of resources/suggested avenues of solution conducted by staff members and other key members of the collaborative	• Key participants receiving information were enthusiastic about the funding options • Community and business representatives present were supportive and encouraging about options for schools securing matching funds through them • The relation between local school personnel and project staff becomes stronger and more open with each meeting • Individuals from all pilot schools have become involved in identifying resources and making suggestions which will support each others improvement programs • A strong sense of togetherness has developed between the pilot schools and their parents/communities • A sense of confidence and trust has developed between the pilot school personnel and the project staff which has increased the flow of open and candid communication of real accomplishments/needs/frustrations/failures	

III.B Accomplished Objectives and Ourcomes - Implementation Year

4.0 Design and test mechanisms for effecting collaborative exchange leading to specific problem solution(s) (continued)

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitati s	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
			• PTA and PTSA organizations within the pilot schools have become involved in planning and implementing school plans	
B. Organize local planning council in each school and hold planning conference (4.e, 4.f, 4.g, 4.h)	1 joint planning conference designed, scheduled and held involving 42 participants 2 follow-up meetings held with Advisory Committees	• Initial development of joint planning conference begun in staff work-sessions • Joint planning conference designed and scheduled in staff meeting • Participants from each pilot school secured for joint planning conference • Joint planning conference held • Conference follow-up meetings held with LEA advisory committees	• Planning conference design provided for high level of interaction between pilot school as well as between individuals • Additional resources and alternative solutions were identifieid during interaction • Participants developed sense of togetherness, confidence and trust and feeling of mutual support which encouraged their continuation and motivated them to renew and strengthen their commitment • Each school had a high level of participation in joint planning conference including principal, teachers, parents, students, and community representatives	

III.B Accomplished Objectives and Ourcomes - Implementation Year

4.0 Design and test mechanisms for effecting collaborative exchange leading to specific problem solution(s) (continued)

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
C. Implement solution(s) in each school, assess results and decide future action (4.j, 4.k, 4.l, 4.m, 4.n)	8 mini-matching grants funded Many TA sessions held in local schools Many meetingsof pilot school project committees held Many improvement activities implemented in local schools	• Meetings held with pilot school principals to establish procedures for budgeting and expending incentive grant monies • Sub-contracts issued to Birmingham and Mobile to cover incentive grants • Technical assistance provided to pilot schools in the selection of specific resources to utilize • Implementation of pilot school improvement programs/activities initiated • Interim assessment of pilot school programs completed • LEA mini-grants approved • Pilot school mini and matching grants approved • Sound process of local improvement has been learned by administrator and representative from pilot schools in Mobile through workshop series	• Pilot schools are being successful in securing outside funds to help support programs • The transfer of funds from the central project level to the local level resulted in a feeling of "our" money as apposed to "their" money and subsequently each paroject committee paid close attention to the careful use of funds	

III.B Accomplished Objectives and Outcomes - Implementation Year

5.0 Document Project Activities and Assess Success of School-Level Implementation

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
A. Gather information needed to document and report progress and refine procedure as appropriate (5.a, 5.b, 5.c, 5.d)		• Forms designed for keeping specific data such as minutes of meetings, summaries of committee actions and plans, etc • Filing system established in all project offices for maintaining correspondences, records, reports, etc. • Interim progress report to NIE completed • Assistance session with NIE • 2nd quarterly report written • Surveys are being deve developed to gather essential information preliminary to implementation of local school improvement plans • Third quarterly report written and distributed • Assessment/evaluation forms and procedures are being designed to assist each school in measuring the impact of their improvement plans	• A true commitment was made by key staff members to maintain consistent, quality documents in a systematic way which would enable easy retrieval • First hand experience was gained by new Project Director in compiling and preparing interim reports • Communication lines established for new project staff and NIE officials that promise to bring about better understandings on key issues and concerns • Documentation format changed to a more workable form • Individuals' commitment to systematic and accurate, documentation continues to be strong • Communications network continues to operate efficiently • Individuals' commitment to systematic and accurate documentation continues • Individuals in pilot schools are becoming more skilled at documenting actions/activities/communications/etc.	• Some difficulties were encountered due to the move in location of project directorship and files • Short time span between assistance session and interim report date

51.

III.B Accomplished Objectives and Ourcomes - Implementation Year

5.0 Document Project Activities and Assess Success of School-Level Implementation

Project Objectives	Achievements		Related Outcomes	
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Benefits (Positive)	Problems (Negative)
B. Collect, analyze, summarize and report data from assessment conference (5.e)		• Accurate records of all documents/correspondence/ communications/minutes/ etc. are being gathered and maintained • Data from Needs Clarification Conferences is bieng analyzed and reviewed by project staff members • Accurate records of all documents/correspondence/ oral communications/ minutes/etc. are being gathered and maintained		
C. Follow evaluation procedures recommended by program developers (5.f)		• Evaluation procedures recommended by developers of "Every Child A Winner" are being followed		

93

IV.A Comparison of Estimated and Actual Person Days For Each Objective

Objectives	Estimated Person Days		Actual Person Days		Objectives	Estimated Person Days		Actual Person Days	
	Prof.	Cler.	Prof.	Cler.		Prof.	Cler.	Prof.	Cler.
1.a Establish Project office	3	-	5	2	1.g Secure concurrence concerning project design	10	-	15	-
1.b Communicate outcome of proposal submission	½	1	2½	1	1.h Specify (and design) project communications network	2	-	8	2
1.c Constitute Project Policy Council	2	½	6	1½	1.i Specify the Birmingham organizational units that will participate	2½	-	2½	1
1.d Establish paramethers of Policy Council's authority	2	½	2	½	1.j Select the Birmingham individuals to be involved	½	-	1½	-
1.e Formulate rules for shared decision making	2	½	2	1½	1.k Secure individual and school system commitment, Birmingham City Schools	10	-	10	-
1.f Clarify roles and responsibility of collaborators	2	½	2	½	1.l Orient key Birmingham personnel to purposes and plan for project	24	-	24	1

IV.A Comparison of Estimated and Actual Person Days For Each Objective

Objectives	Estimated Person Days		Actual Person Days		Objectives	Estimated Person Days		Actual Person Days	
	Prof.	Cler.	Prof.	Cler.		Prof.	Cler.	Prof.	Cler.
1.m Specify Mobile organizational units	4½	-	2½	-					
1.n Select the Mobile individuals to be involved	½	-	1½	-	2.a Provide information to LEA(s) concerning AEL/DAP (N.A.) model	14	2	18	5
1.o Secure individual and school system commitment, Mobile County Schools	10	-	10	-	2.b Identify prospective N.A. conference participants and validators	6	-	22	2
1.p Orient key Mobile personnel to purposes and plan for project	24	-	24	1	2.c Implement AEL/DAP N.A. model in Mobile	37	2	62	6
1.q Design awareness compaign for project	14	-	12	4	2.d Implement AEL/DAP N.A. model in Birmingham	37	2	70	6
1.r Implement project awareness campaign	24	-	35	2	2.e Analyze Mobile N.A. data	5	3	15	8

IV.A Comparison of Estimated and Actual Person Days For Each Objective

Objectives	Estimated Person Days		Actual Person Days		Objectives	Estimated Person Days		Actual Person Days	
	Prof.	Cler.	Prof.	Cler.		Prof.	Cler.	Prof.	Cler.
2.f Analyze Birmingham N.A. data	5	3	7	5					
2.g Analyze N.A. results to identify common and system-specific needs	2	-	10	4	3.a Select common priority needs	12	1	21	1
2.h Design "Needs Synthesis Seminar"	9	2	15	4	3.b. Select Birmingham's specific priority needs	3	-	3	-
2.i Conduct "Needs Synthesis Seminar"	56	1	64	5	3.c Select Mobile's specific priority needs*	3	-	35	5
2.j Document and report results of "Needs Synthesis Seminar"	6	4	12	8	3.d Identify resources that offer potential solutions to identified needs	8	-	20	6
2.k Develop written report re: N.A.	4	4	6	5	3.e Design a resource conference	10	4	84	38

* Mobile conducted follow-up conference for this purpose

IV.A Comparison of Estimated and Actual Person Days For Each Objective

Objectives	Estimated Person Days		Actual Person Days	
	Prof.	Cler.	Prof.	Cler.
3.f Provide for the active participation of role-alike individuals	82	-	151	-
3.g Gather participants' assessment re: each resource	4	-	25	9
3.h Arrange for role-alike participants to share perceptions and solutions	70	-	79	-
3.i Compile and analyze participants' assessment and input	8	4	17	8
3.j Prepare written report	8	3	16	6
3.k Follow-up conference in Birmingham**	101	2	-	-

Objectives	Estimated Person Days		Actual Person Days	
	Prof.	Cler.	Prof.	Cler.
3.1 Follow up conference in Mobile	101	2	-	-
4.a Agree upon selection criteria	9	2	12	3
4.b Develop tentative agenda	18	3	19	3
4.c Reach consensus on substantive agenda	10	-	19	-

** Lack of resources required that these objectives be delayed

IV.A Comparison of Estimated and Actual Person Days For Each Objective

Objectives	Estimated Person Days		Actual Person Days	
	Prof.	Cler.	Prof.	Cler.
5.a Document and evaluate Policy Council	3	2	7	2
5.b Use results of N.A. to develop goals	4	4	2	2
5.c Use results of resource assessments to identify alternative strategies	24	5	19	5
5.d Document use and effectiveness of communications network	14	4	6	1
5.e Design evaluation procedures that will measure incentives disincentives	6	3	4	3
5.f Implement evaluation procedures designed in 5.e	5	-	3	1
5.g Draft recommendations concerning project governance	3	1	3	1
5.h Develop preliminary operational plan	8	5	14	8
5.i Reach concurrence concerning preliminary plan	10	-	2	-
5.j Develop operational plan	5	5	20	10
6.a Complete contractual arrangements with AEL	2	1	2	1

103

IV.A Comparison of Estimated and Actual Person Days For Each Objective

Objectives	Estimated Person Days		Actual Person Days		Objectives	Estimated Person Days		Actual Person Days	
	Prof.	Cler.	Prof.	Cler.		Prof.	Cler.	Prof.	Cler.
6.b Provide logistical support to AEL staff	30	-	36	6	Prepare Final History/Report AEL Project Staff	1 -	1 -	1 1	1 4
Prepare Quarterly Progress Report #1	2	1	6	4	Prepare Operational-Year Proposal	5	5	20	10
Prepare Quarterly Progress Report #2	2	1	6	4	Prepare Final Report	-	-	12	8
Prepare Quarterly Progress Report #3***	2	1	8	2					
Prepare Preliminary Plan	8	5	14	8					
Prepare Written History/Report (Draft) Project Staff AEL	- 4	- 2	4 4	2 2					

***Preparation materials ans session with NIE Review Panel

IV.B Actual Person Days For Each Objective - Year 2 (includes Project Staff and LEA Administrators)

Objective	Actual Person Days		Objective	Actual Person Days		Objective	Actual Person Days	
	Prof.	Cler.		Prof.	Cler.		Prof.	Cler.
1.a Reorganize project office	12	4	1.h Form Birmingham local school project committees	20	3	1.o Determine level of commitment/interest/desire to continue by each pilot school in year one for collaborative	8	2
1.b Communicate outcome of proposal submission	1	½	1.i Establish Mobile advisory committees	2	1	1.p Communicate above decisions to all parties	2	1
1.c Expand Policy Council membership to include new collaborative parties	2	-	1.j Establish Birmingham advisory committee	2	1	2.a Refine/expand resource file	See Attachments	
1.d Re-establish or modify parameters of Policy council's authority and orientate all members to new components of governance/operation	13	2	1.k Orientate Mobile local school project committee	1½	-	2.b Identify/index additional resources (focusing upon needs emerged from needs assessment) for inclusion in file	See Attachments	
1.e Secure Policy Council concurrence on project design/plans for implementation/institutionalization	included in 1.d		1.l Orientate Birmingham local school project committee	2½	-	2.c Develop plan for describing (abstracting) resource file holdings	See Attachments	
1.f Specify project communications requirement and design network	3	1	1.m Orientate Mobile advisory committee	1	1	2.d Analyze/improve procedures whereby members share ideas/practices/resources and draw more from resource file	See Attachments	
1.g Form Mobile local school project committees	12	3	1.n Orientate Birmingham advisory committee	1	1	2.e Develop plan for regularly informing member of file contents	See Attachments	

IV.B Actual Person Days For Each Objective - Year 2 (includes Project Staff and LEA Administrators)

Objective	Actual Person Days		Objective	Actual Person Days		Objective	Actual Person Days	
	Prof.	Cler.		Prof.	Cler.		Prof.	Cler.
3.a Develop analysis process to insure maximum involvement of teachers/students/parents/principal/community in each school	2	1	4.c Solicit and/or identify collaborative resource possibilities for matching needs and solutions	As Needed		4.j Implement solution(s) in each school	As Needed	
3.b Use problem analysis process in each school to produce a clear, concrete problem statement	4	2	4.d Investigate outside resources in matching needs/solutions	As Needed		4.k Develop assessment procedures for each school	16	4
3.c Iventory resources/justify those which offer alternative solutions to the needs of each school emerging from 3.b	As Needed		4.e Establish local planning councils in each school in Birmingham	10	-	4.l Plan and schedule assessment conference in each school	Included Above	
3.d Prepare action agenda/implementation timeline for each school	24	12	4.f Establish local planning council in each school in Mobile	6	-	4.m Assess results of implementations in each school	30	5
3.e Communicate results of above activities	2	½	4.g Plan and schedule planning conference	9	2	4.n Decide to continue/modify implementation or institute another more promising solution	8	
4.a Plan/conduct awareness/orientation re: procedures and requirements for securing collaborative support and resources	2	½	4.h Conduct planning conference	18	-	5.a Maintain accurate records describing major activities and progress toward attainment of objectives	As Needed	
4.b Profile each school's problem statement needs and communicate to all parties	8	2	4.i Match need(s) and solution (resources) in each school	As Needed		5.b Make interim progress reports to NIE	15	10

IV.B Actual Person Days For Each Objective - Year 2 (includes Project Staff and LEA Administrators)

Objective	Actual Person Days		Objective	Actual Person Days		Objective	Actual Person Days	
	Prof.	Cler.		Prof.	Cler.		Prof.	Cler.
5.c Plan/design/conduct surveys and other intelligence gathering activities as needed to determine success of school-level implementations year 2	16	4	6.d Prepare draft outline of final report of accomplishments for NIE	12	6			
			6.e Prepare draft final report for NIE	20	8			
5.d Refine above plan as appropriate for reporting implementation sucess beyond year 2	As Appropriate							
5.e Collect/analyze/summarize report data from assessment conference (proposed in 4.1)	2	2	6.f Present project accomplishments to NIE	NA				
5.f Follow evaluation procedures recommended by developers in schools where a specific program is adopted	As Appropriate		6.g Prepare final report for NIE	Estimate 2	2			
6.a Develop a plan for sharing project success with other Alabama urban schools	1	1						
6.b Determine information to be shared and method(s) for disseminating it	2	1						
6.c Prepare information regarding project outcomes and disseminate to appropriate audiences	18	5						

V. Descriptive Summary of Project CAUSE Implementation Year

Thomas P. Ryan

Appalachia Educational Laboratory

Introduction and Background

The purposes of this section are (1) to provide a descriptive summary of the major events of the implementation year of Project CAUSE, (2) provide a tentative assessment of some identified outcomes of the project, and (3) to set the stage for a followup study of those actual or potential outcomes best identified and analyzed retrospectively.

It should be noted here that AEL has played multiple roles during both the planning and implementation years of the project, as one of the four major collaborators. The author of this section has served on the policy council for the duration of the project. AEL also provided the needs assessment process for the planning year, played a major role in the Lakepoint Resource Conference, played an active role in the Birmingham Documentation and Sharing Conference, and provided presenters for three of the dissemination conferences in the spring of '83.

AEL has thus been a collaborator (primarily for technical assistance) as well as the project historian - and provides a tentative assessment of outcomes later in this section from the perspective of the only collaborator from outside Alabama.

Information on the six events of the past year participated in by AEL has been collected through observation and interviews, as well as review of documentation. AEL has reviewed the substantial documentation on the other four major events, and a representative sample of the documentation of the 60-plus intra-city conferences, workshops, and seminars.

Much of the documentation is too bulky for inclusion in this report.

The project office in Mobile has given assurance that it will be retained and available for inspection as desired.

Summary of Major Events of the Implementation Year

There were two major events during the year which brought together the four major institutional elements of the Collaborative (Mobile, Birmingham, the State Department of Education and AEL):

1. The first Policy Council meeting (6/16/82)
2. The second Policy Council meeting and inter-city sharing conference (2/1/83)

There were four major events involving three of the four institutional collaborators (the SDE, AEL, and the host city) - two in Birmingham and two in Mobile:

3. Documentation and Sharing Conferences in Birmingham (April 18-19)
4-5. two dissemination Conferences in Mobile
6. one dissemination Conference in Birmingham

There were four major events involving two of the collaborative institutions (The SDE and the host city) - two in Mobile and two in Birmingham:

7-8. two dissemination Conferences in Birmingham
9. Documentation and Sharing Conference in Mobile (May 23)
10. Three dissemination Conferences in Mobile

In addition to these ten collaborative events, there were 63 intra-city workshops and conferences (33 RD+D workshops and 5 Administrative Research Seminars in Mobile; 25 RD+D workshops in Birmingham) to which project CAUSE was a direct contributor - providing either the substance of the session through previous efforts or funding for all or part of the event.

The six events in which AEL participated are described in more detail below.

1. The first Policy Council Meeting (June 1982)

This was the organizational meeting for the implementation year of project CAUSE. The planning year was reviewed, the funding situation was

explained, the four collaborators reemphasized their commitment to the project, and planning for the second year was accomplished. A lengthy and detailed fact sheet was provided to the members, together with a list of decisions requiring the attention of the council. Key decisions reached by the council involved the approval of the strategy of providing incentive and matching grants to the LEA's and specific cooperating schools for program implementation through a mini-grant proposal process. A detailed description of the meeting and its outcomes is provided in Appendix A.

2. The Second Policy Council Meeting and Joint Conference (February, 1983)

The Policy Council, which had received the mini-grant proposals in advance of the meeting, approved several of the grants and issued specific instructions to others as to required revisions - delegating final approval of these latter ones to the project leadership contingent on the appropriate changes.

The other major topic of this meeting was the establishment of a major-event agenda for the rest of the year, with emphasis on the specifics of the dissemination and sharing conferences in April and May of 1983. A detailed description of the meeting and its outcomes is presented in Appendix C.

The major purpose of the joint conference was to provide participants from the two cities an opportunity for face-to-face interaction on the accomplishments (and remaining needs) of their school improvement programs. Activities included one-on-one, small group, and large-group sessions - with matching varying from role-alike to grade-level and program areas. CAUSE staff members, SDE, and AEL participants provided technical assistance to sessions as requested.

There was noticeable enthusiasm on the part of the LEA participants for the process and outcomes of the session. A tabulation of responses to an evaluation instrument is to be found in Appendix D.

3. Documentation and Sharing Conference in Birmingham (April)

Five Birmingham School (4 elementary K-6 or K-8 and 1 High School) presented their CAUSE- generated programs, summarized below.

Central Park Elementary - This school describes its major priority as improving school-community relations. CAUSE generated program elements, funded through their mini-grant and stimulated by previous conferences, include: (1) The "Every Child a Winner" program, (2) a new reporting system to parents, (3) a strengthened resource room with many new materials, and (4) a very active and supportive volunteer program. As part of this latter program, which won a city-wide award during the year, the parent volunteers run the in-school suspension program. Plans for continuation in 1983-84 include strengthening of the parent volunteer program and increased focus on improvement of teacher morale (another CAUSE emphasis area) through awareness sessions, use of consultants, sharing of RD+D, and development of a positive reinforcement system for teachers.

Jones Valley Elementary - This very active program, in one of the first schools to become involved with Project CAUSE, involves: (1) three volunteer tutors in the school every day, (2) adoption of "Every Child a Winner", (3) a full-time equivalent Physical Education volunteer position (a moral-booster for teachers), (4) a greatly upgraded play area, (5) a computer system (the school board matched local funds for the computer: CAUSE provided the software), (6) an ongoing school-parent awareness program,

including a large September meeting followed by daily teacher-volunteer conferences for which every teacher in the school volunteered to stay an extra half hour every day.

Outcomes of these activities include observable rises in student scores, improved teacher morale, and detailed diagnostic reports on each child in the school provided to the parents. The school has indicated strong commitment to continuation and strengthening of these programs in 1983-84 and beyong.

Tuggle Elementary - This school entered the CAUSE project with two primary goals - increased parent involvement and improved teacher motivation. Administrators and teachers alike credit CAUSE for motivating its several program areas, and specifically credit interaction with Mobile schools for key information on parent reactions to various parent involvement approaches. Elements in the Tuggle program are: (1) an active volunteer program, operating in the school every day, (2) a computer provided by the local business community (CAUSE prompted the school administration to solicit such support), (3) "Project Business" (a Junior Achievement spinoff which they learned about at a CAUSE Conference), (4) "Talents Unlimited" (a strong Mobile program which they learned about through CAUSE) and (5) development and maintenance of detailed skill development/maintenance folders on each child in the school.

Two major outcomes are described by the school personnel as "parent involvement which exceeded all expectations" and "increased support from the school board resulting from our visible efforts to improve the school". Program continuation past the project seems assured at Tuggle.

Eagan Elementary - This school, a latecomer of the project, has not advanced as far as some of the others. In-place program elements attributable to CAUSE include (1) "Talents Unlimited" (learned from Mobile, (2) use of resource speakers from the community, and (3) funds from the PTA to match the CAUSE funding for playground equipment and PE materials (a major need in inner-city, low SES areas in which Eagan is a prime-example). Eagan's progress will be carefully watched as part of the followup study.

Phillips High School - The principal of this High School credits CAUSE with creating major attitudinal changes at the administrative level, particularly toward parent/community involvement, teacher motivation and morale, and career/vocational education. Specific elements of the resultant program include: (1) decreased number and length (with tighter agendas) of faculty meetings, (2) a successful effort to improve PTSA attendance through improved communication and emphasis, (3) increased written communication to parents (a newsletter paid for by CAUSE through the mini-grant; inspiration and some funding for a videotape highlight presentation of the school), (4) a computer lab as an indirect spinoff of increased administrative attention to instruction and teacher requests, and (5) a Ford Foundation award (with primary assistance from AEL through CAUSE contacts), (6) establishment of a career exploration laboratory. The school perceives primary outcomes as improvement in the attitude of the community toward the school (including the media-no small accomplishment in Birmingham), improved teacher morale, and marked improvement in administrator-teacher relations.

By all accounts, this school has changed significantly as a result of the project.

The following parallel presentation of programs in the Mobile Schools is extracted from documentation and interviews, since AEL was not present at its documentation and sharing conference.

Hillsdale Middle School - This school selected pre-vocational programming as a priority for CAUSE-related activity. The stated goals, as expressed in its mini-grant proposal, are: (1) to help alleviate the need for a better educated, better trained, and more productive workforce, (2) to address the need in the 80's for accountability for more than basic skill competencies, and (3) to meet the responsibility of the school for establishing a working relationship with parent and community people.

To meet these needs, the school has created "Hillsdale Offers Pre-Vocational Education" (H.O.P.E.) which plans to offer a range of pre-vocational skills and experiences, utilize community business representatives for information, and to broaden its parent volunteer program to help coordinate and implement the program.

Major developmental work on the program is occuring during the summer of 1983. The following study will focus on its activities and outcomes.

Dickson Elementary School - This school has focused on the "Every Child a Winner" program as its CAUSE - related activity. It describes its objectives (every child K-3 to be included) as (1) to provide developmental movement experiences for children centered on themes of space awareness, body awareness, quality of body movement, and relationships, (2) to eliminate competition activities except when child-designed, (3) to utilize the discovery learning approach to teaching movement, and (4) to encourage children to reach their personal potential, in which winning occurs as each child does his/her best.

The program design provides developmental movement experiences for children-taught through creative games, creative dance, and educational gymnastics. A planning committee has been established-composed of parents, community leaders, and school personnel. The PTA is providing financial support and aiding in monitoring the program. CAUSE funding is used for consultants to train for program implementation. Dickson expects to expand these programs through grade 5, based on their perception of its success during 1982-83. Dickson's experience has stimulated interest in the program from several other Mobile schools, to which CAUSE provided training during the summer of 1983.

Shaw High School - This school selected school-community relations as its area of emphasis. A study committee composed of faculty and PTSA member generated a curriculum fair project entitled "Show Off Shaw". Its major goals are: (1) to give students, teachers, parents and the local community an opportunity to work together to promote interest and pride in Shaw High School, (2) to provide information on community and higher-education offerings and requirements, and (3) to provide information on Curriculum programs and activities available at Shaw. Planning and preparation begain in November 1982 for the event, which was held in March 1983. Committees were formed to handle each aspect of the fair; community groups responded very favorably, and the 1983 fair was judged to be a great success by the participants, to whom "the sense of pride and ownership in Shaw High School was clearly evident".

The school received formal commendations from the School Superintendents Office, the PTSA, and community groups for the program, which it expects to enlarge and continue in 1984 and beyond.

4-5. Two Dissemination Conferences in Mobile

At the middle school Conference, the Director of AEL's Career Guidance Division presented a day-long workshop on pre-vocational guidance. This reinforced Hillsdale's program, and AEL is providing ongoing technical assistance to Hillsdale. As a result of the conference, the other middle schools in Mobile are addressing the subject with AEL's assistance.

At the High School Conference, the Director of AEL's School-Family Relations Division presented a day-long workshop on school-family relations. He has been invited back to work with Mobile's High School (Shaw in particular) to help address their continuing school-family relations concerns.

6. One Dissemination Conference in Birmingham

At this high-school conference, AEL's School-Family Relations R+D Director conducted a day-long conference similar to the one mentioned in the previous paragraph, with similar results.

As a result of these conference contacts, AEL is maintaining ongoing relationships with the Birmingham and Mobile School Systems. As mentioned elsewhere, AEL has also made its Regional Exchange library and search services available, as well as publicized other free R+D services available to the LEA's as well as the SDE. The degree of institutionalization and followup of these activities during 1984 will be a subject for the followup study.

Relationships between Purposes and Accomplishments

There are four major stated purposes of Project CAUSE - in summary (1)improved capacity to use outside R+D and strengthened internal R+D capacity, (2) development of inter-LEA linkages and strengthening of linkages with the SDE and AEL, (3) development of a serviceable

collaborative which might serve as a model, and (4) improvement of policies, practices, and equity through collaboration, linkages, and increased R+D utilization.

The rather considerable accomplishments of Project CAUSE relate to these four purposes in differing amounts and degrees, for a variety of reasons. The remainder of this subsection will examine these relationships in greater detail.

Purpose I - increase capacity to use resources available through R+D agencies and to strengthen internal R+D capabilities.

It seems clear from the number and variety of programs in place at the end of the school year which are directly attributable to project activities (detailed elsewhere in the report) that the first half of this purpose has been substantially achieved.

While there is some evidence of improved linkage between schools and central office R+D personnel in each of the LEA's, and R+D personnel in each LEA have had substantial exposure to R+D results from other sources, the actual strengthening of internal R+D within the systems has yet to be established. This is a key area to be addressed in the followup study.

Purpose 2 - develop linkages between the systems and build upon linkages between SDE and other members (LEA's and AEL) to CAUSE.

Both the SDE representative and the coordinator of the project (in Mobile) are convinced that linkages between the SDE and the LEA's has been materially strengthened through this project. AEL has had ample opportunity to observe the excellent working relationship, particularly with Mobile.

The SDE and AEL representatives have had a long-standing working relationship which has been maintained and strengthened through the project

in their mutual opinions.

AEL began the project with no linkage to either Mobile or Birmingham. LEA representatives and the AEL representatives developed a positive but non-specific linkage during the planning year. This was reinforced and given specific context at the Lakepoint Conference toward the end of the planning year (5 AEL staff members and over 100 LEA representatives participated) and has been strengthened substantially through substantive presentations and followup (in areas of school-family relations and vocational guidance) in recent months. AEL also has substantial free service to provide, through its Regional Exchange program - of which the LEA's are now aware. The performance and intensity of the relationship will be a fit subject for the followup study.

Purpose 3 - Constitute a collaborative that is viable and effective in serving needs of its members and as a model to others.

As in the case of the first two purposes, this is a two-part item. It seems clear from the number of activities, number of attendees (described in sections II-IV) and the number of ongoing school-level programs directly attributable to CAUSE, that the collaborative has been effective in serving the identified needs of its members. Participants confirm this conclusion in the event - evaluations completed at the sessions (examples in Appendix E).

The viability of CAUSE as a model for others is yet to be clearly established, particularly the city-to-city component which formed the original basis for the collaborative. Exemplary linkages have been established between the SDE, AEL, and each of the cities independently. The city-to-city linkages seems to be the weakest, for several possible reasons: (1) The distance between Mobile and Birmingham, and attendant lost time in travel for collaborative events, (2) The cost of extensive travel between cities given

the shortfall between (originally) anticipated and actual funding, and (3) the very strong perception in both cities that collaboratiion was less necessary during the implementation year than it had been during the planning year. Of the three reasons, this last may be the most important.

More data and analysis are needed for assessment of the relative importance of these reasons (and others which may surface) and the implications for future urban collaboration. This area will be emphasized in the follow-up study.

Purpose 4 - establish a collaborative, develop linkages among its members, and increase R+D utilization and capacities as a means of improving educational policies, practices, and equity within member agencies.

The collaborative nature of the project, linkages among members, increased R+D utilization, and capacity - building - as they affect schools and school programs - have been addressed earlier. The effect on practices, as reflected in these programs, is clear and substantial. The effects on policy and equity are less clear. Administrators, parents, and central-office people have been involved in the project, and indications are positive-particularly in the school-community relations areas. There are also recent indications that the business community as represented by Chambers of Commerce in the two cities, is becoming more interested and actively involved in solving educational problems. The project, and the schools involved, have been diligent in applying equity consideration (both gender and race) in project activities. Whether all of these are short-term and project-specific, however, or whether they represent real and significant policy changes remain to be determined. A major element in the followup study will address the degree of institutionalization of the values, attitudes, and accomplishment represented by the project outcomes to date.

Tentative Assessment of Outcomes and Implications

Outcomes

This project has produced a number of outcomes, some of which can be assessed in the short run and some of which cannot. Some specific, observable outcomes include:

- hundreds of local educators, parents, and school administrators have been exposed to R+D based school improvement projects and activities and significant numbers have identified activities and programs resulting from this exposure.
- eight pilot schools in the two cities have begun programs with sufficiently promising results to assure their continuation past the end of the project.
- collaborative relationships between the SDE, AEL, and the two individual systems have been perceptibly strengthened, with predictable advantages to follow-particularly for the two LEA's.
- the number of parents and community people being actively involved in developing pilot school plans has increased beyond the original goal
- the sense of "ownership" of grass roots people in school plans has surpassed expectations
- pilot school administrators have become aware of their instinct to be more "crisis management" oriented than "long range-sound improvement"oriented
- local school administrators are beginning to take a close look at their leadership styles and are requesting information from current research on the topic
- frequent, candid interaction with parent/community people is guiding local school personnel toward a total reassessment of their attitude toward "outsiders" and their human relations skills and behaviors
- new individuals from the LEAs central office level are becoming involved in the pilot school plans and the collaborative as a whole
- informal communication between individuals involved with pilot school plans and non-pilot school people is sparking interest in school improvement and resulting in requests to the local coordinator for assistance with program development and technical training for schools who are not members of this collaborative

- administrators in two of the Mobile pilot schools have communicated that skills learned about documentation formats have helped them in their day-to-day operation of their schools and are using suggested formats for other school activities

- in two of the pilot schools, parents have shown an interest in becoming involved with teachers to write grant proposals to outside funding sources to secure additional money for school improvements

- the Mobile Chamber of Commerce has sent an investigation team to Dallas, Texas to look at their adopt-a-school program and is seriously considering it for the Education Committee's Program for 1984.

- several IHEs have become actively involved with two of the pilot school programs

- the NDN - "Every Child a Winner" program has been adopted in three of the pilot schools and in four additional Mobile schools for the 83-84 year

- additional offices in the SDE have become involved in providing financial and technical assistance for activities in local school within the LEA's

- Many people have come to understand the meaning of collaboration specifically that collaboration, the working together for the good of all, is fostered whenever a group of people come together and work through purposeful processes such as those used in the project

- Much of the real value of such a project may be in attitudinal changes rather than in concrete program. Specifically:

    - increased knowledge, involvement, and sense of ownership in local schools, as well as an acceptance of school problems as their own and a commitment to making improvements

    - confidence in the broad based improvement of school-community relations resulting from knowledge that other groups were endeavoring to solve common problems (confidence that they were "not in this alone")

    - volunteer involvement of parents and community people increased the school personnel's appreciation that concern and commitment truly exist

    - volunteer involvement of school personnel increased the parents/community's appreciation that the local school personnel's commitment to improving relations is sincere

Implications

It is evident that this project can point to a lengthy list of immediate outcomes in areas of information, attitude and action. Hundreds of interactions have taken place, ongoing programs are in place, and participants from all the collaborative institutions are proclaiming themselves changed by the experience.

The eventual success of the project, however, will be determined by its "staying-power" the extent to which programs become institutionalized, new attitudes become permanent ones as indicated by subsequent actions, people continue to use new-found skills and information sources to address new problems, and the extent to which these outcomes affect policy and equity as well as practice.

Two major themes become evident as this project progressed. The first was that face-to-face collaboration between the two urban systems are less important during the implementation year than it had been during the planning year. The second is that the concept of collaboration is more significant to long-term effect than the programmatic elements. Real commitment to community involvement, improved administrator-teacher relations, continuous examination of style related to changing needs, and the continuous career-long need for collaborative efforts to solve problems will be the ultimate test.

One important goal of this project was to serve as a model of urban collaboration. Its many successes certainly argue for such a conclusion. However, the relative weakness of the link between the two LEA's - as compared to the stronger links among the other participants - argues for further analysis of the content and structure of the various linkages, and the extent to which the successes have taken root, before the applicability of CAUSE as a model can be suggested. The following

section describes a proposed followup study, one purpose of which is to address the modeling question.

Proposed follow-up

AEL, as part of its Regional Exchange Program funded by NIE, performs an R+D project in each of its member states - including Alabama - each year. Project CAUSE has been the subject of this activity for the last two years. AEL can think of no better focus for its 1983-84 efforts - and the SEA representative agrees - than to address the important issues raised by this project in a followup study.

As indicated earlier, there are several major issues: (1) will the pilot programs continue and extend their programs past the end of CAUSE, as they indicate that they will? (2) Are the attitudinal changes proclaimed by the participants deep-seated enough to service the lack of prolonged project stimulus-will evidence of subsequent actions give evidence of real attitudinal change? (3) What is the relative importance of the various reasons given for decreased inter-city collaboration during the implementation year-and are there others not yet identified?

(4) Will the strong institutional linkages among the SDE, AEL, and the individual systems continue and accelerate, as now seems likely? (5) Will the strengthened school-community relations cited so often by the schools continue to improve - and what governs this in the absence of CAUSE? (6) Will the intra-city systemic linkages (county offices/school administrator/teacher/parent) cited by the project as major successes continue and improve? (7) What inferences can eventually be drawn from the past - CAUSE year which might (or might not) certify CAUSE as a model for urban collaboration - and what form

might it take (intra-system, inter-system, multiple institution)?

AEL intends to address these questions through a series of questionnaires administered in Mobile, Birmingham, the SDE, and AEL Divisions at intervals throughout the year supplemented by targeted interviews, observations, and review of documentation where available. Specifics of the study will be developed jointly with the SDE representative.

VI. Learnings and Unanticipated Outcomes

The following propositions which were included in the initial CAUSE proposal proved to be valid and reliable, holding up extremely well throughout the life of the Project:

1. All parties should be actively involved in planning from the earliest stages.
2. A successful collaborative must be formed for the "right" reasons at the right time with active involvement of the "right" people.
3. Participation must be voluntary, participants must have potential for meaningful commitment and follow through and the time to participate.
4. Effective collaboration requires a common interest in a significant goal.
5. Adequate time and attention must be devoted to cooperative planning, organizing, developing, and nurturing the Collaborative.
6. Adequate provisions must be made for shared decision making and equal participation.
7. A standard set of operating procedures ("ground rules") must be established and govening structure (policy body) which provides egalitarian control and promotes a democratic spirit must be formed in order to assure shared responsibility and authority for policy making.
8. The initiating organization must build trust, establish credibility and remove any threat it poses to other collaborators.
9. Provisions must be made for a clear understanding of and agreement

on intent, conditions, roles, responsibilities, constraints, expectations, division of labor, and resources and rewards.

10. All parties must understand and accept the fact that the tasks involved in mutually productive, effective collaboration are highly demanding, time consuming and complex, and that parties often must "give" more than they receive before the principle of reciprocity or mutual exchange begins operating.
11. Project goals should be realistic and reasonable, objectives should be clear and precise, and provisions for early visible accomplishment should be assured.
12. An effective, two-way communication system must be carefully developed, organized and maintained not only to make possible easy, frequent and productive dialog between and among all parties, but to encourage and force it.
13. There must be a feeling that the Collaborative is benefitting individuals and their organizations, as well as the group as a whole.
14. A sense of local ownership (both psychological and financial) and recognition that local needs are being met are essential to sustaining an innovation or new capacity.
15. The Collaborative must be so structured that active participation from the organizations is both desirable and essential, and success is greatly dependent upon the interdependence of its members.
16. Local educators are more receptive to practical (practitioner-based, field-based, experience-based, craft knowledge) or action research approaches to problem solving than to theoretical solutions or esoteric discussions.

17. The human element (people-to-people interaction) is a critical factor in efforts to link research and resources to practice.
18. In a school system, significant change usually occurs at the building level which means that the quality, attitude and leadership of the principal and the involvement and perception of a need to change on the part of teachers are essential conditions for lasting educational improvement.
19. Flexibility must be built in to allow LEAs to identify system-specific needs/problems, explore resource availability and possible solutions and pursue an intra-agency approach for sharing success.

A number of specific learnings gleaned from Project CAUSE tend to reinforce many of these propositions and served to shape Project plans and activities. Those deserving mention here are:

- Consensus Decision Making

  Decision making by consensus is sometimes difficult, time consuming and exasperating, but the benefits/advant ges are well worth the effort The following advantages associated with consensus decision making were derived from the CAUSE Policy Council (governing body) meetings and several other group activities which encouraged participatory decision making .

  1. Maximizes inclusion, input and responsibility of all members in decision-making process; therefore, group becomes more efficient in satisfying members' personal goals.
  2. Leadership functions diffused among all members; therefore, group becomes more effective because different leaders emerge depending upon the issue at hand and upon the recognized competencies of the participants.

3. Full and free communications take place between members without reguard to ascribed rank.
4. Participatory strategies are particularly effective in groups where the task goals are unstructured and where the goal of the group is innovative or creative problem solving.
5. Members are more committed to decisions made by the group and to the implementation of the products which emerge as a result of the group's efforts because they have had input into the solution.
6. Builds group cohesion.
7. Minimizes risk of one or two persons actively sabotaging the decision.
8. Avoids quick compromise techniques, such as majority rule, trading, or average of rankings, thus breaking a "strain toward convergence."
9. "Assembly effect bonus" potential of a group to outperform its own "best" resource.
10. Satisfaction with group decision.
11. More commitment to decisions reached.

- Apathy and Urban School Improvement

Parents, teachers, students, community members, principals, central office staff in urban schools are not apathetic--they are not unconcerned and disinterested. They do care. They want to be involved in improving schools and schooling. Contrary to pupular opinion (fanned by the prophets of gloom and doom) non-educators (e.g. parents, students business/labor representatives) are extremely interested in and committed to planning local school improvement efforts and are very willing to give of their time and energy to planning and implementation activities. The following "learnings" resulted form the involvement of the total body of interested people in the urban school improvements:

1. While non-educators are interested and committed to being involved they demand that planning and implementation activities be well planned, highly structured, specific goal oriented and expediently carried out.
2. The business community is much more open to helping a single school meet its specific improvement goals than in contributing to a large total urban system's improvement.
3. The attitudes of central office and local school administrators must be changed to one where they view the non-educator contributors as "equal partners" in improvement rather than as "mere helpers".

- Predictors for Successful Collaboratives

The success of a collaborative depends to a great extent upon the overall attitude of the individual collaborators, particularly with regard to their willingness to be involved in the activities of the collaborative. We have learned that success is dependent on many or all of the following elements and/or conditions:

1. Leadership is the single highest predictor of success. The committment to the project held by key persons who take the lead will determine the collaboratives success.
2. Within an LEA, the position of the Collaborative's leader is an important enabler and should be one which is within the central administrative organization and dealing with all local school and central office administrators frequently and directly.
3. Most individuals who "buy into" a collaborative do so because they have a personal/professional respect for and trust in the individuals who are leading or promoting it. During the formative period in a collaborative's development, most individuals'

commitment is conditional and tentative and is greatly dependent upon their rapport with and/or loyalty to the leaders.

4. The higher the level of interaction between and among individuals from different agencies in the Collaborative, the more important and constructive the event in building the incentives for collaboration.

5. The success of a collaborative depends to a great extent upon the overall attitude of the individual collaborators, particularly with regard to their willingness to be involved in the activities of the collaborative. It is not how much an individual collaborator has to contrubute, but how much it is willing to draw from the common resourte pool established for the collaborative that makes a collaborative effort successful. While collaboratives should provide for equity in decision making, they should not be established on the premise that all members/parties can contribute equally to the resource pool. What is important is that each member to the collaborative have an equal opportunity to contribute its strengths/successes and to draw from collaborative's resources a possible solution to a recognized need.

6. Although large financial grants may not be required to form a collaborative or to teach people to operate in a collaborative mode some outside funding is critical. Relatively small amounts of incentive or "seed" money provided impetus, gave Project validity and credibility, generated considerable interest, and led to provacative innovative approaches which resulted in acquisition of substantial additional resources.

7. Realistic, attainable goals and activities which provide early, visible results and produce a positive feeling of accomplishment are extremely important to Project success.

These learnings strongly suggest that urban schools are not doomed to failure or mediocrity. Improvement of urban schools and schooling is neither a hopeless nor unrealistic expectation. Committed people operating in a collaborative mode with a strong positive leadership and support can and have effected change.

Additional learnings and unanticipated outcomes focus around the extensive involvement by AIDS in efforts to get local educators to make greater use of RD & D resulted in learnings which merit reporting.

- Local Utilization of R & D

1. Sponsoring attendance of selected individuals from LEAs at workshops and conferences was one strategy that proved to be especially effective in achieving this goal when the following criteria were used.

   In deciding whom to involve (from LEAs) in sponsored workshop activities, the following conditions seem to justify the cost and make a noticeable difference in the likelihood of benefits being derived from attendance.

   Involve LEAs that have:

   (1) Leadership who have evidenced interest in or commitment to research-based solutions to identified problems.

   (2) Demonstrated commitment or will commit to improving curriculum and instruction.

   (3) Strong emphasis upon professional development and comprehensive personnel improvement program.

   (4) Understanding of the importance of sending teams of individuals from the LEA who:

      (a) Are headed by an individual in a leadership position.

      (b) Are comprised of a broad range of individuals

(e.g., classroom teachers, principal(s), central office support staff).

(c) Recognized the value of R & D-based solutions and relevance of these to local problems/needs.

(d) Are committed to "taking R & D Home" for futher consideration, sharing and follow up as appropriate.

2. Dissemination workshops held in the LEAs involving interested administrators, teachers, parents, and community/business people was another strategy that proved successful. The premise underlying these workshops is before an individual or group of individuals are ready for R & D information they must either identify their own specific needs or they must closely identify with another school's need and have interest in that school's solutions. Providing the right information to the right person(s) at the right time in usable form is a definition of dissemination to which local educators can relate. They generally have neither the time nor the interest to use lengthy impractical information packages. They will use summaries, syntheses and highly relevant targeted information
3. Research information must be presented in a usable form. Lengthy, technical reports and articles are not considered practical by local school people. Yet, short to the point articles or briefs on specific solutions or resources are very well received.
4. More lengthy and complete reports and documents are usable by immediate availability of information on a local level is essential. When the potential user initiates a request for R & D information it must be supplied witin a very short period of time (24 to 48 hours) or other issues and conderns arise and interfere with its use.

5. It is essential to have a person or office within the LEA where local school people can make contact and communicate with someone about the information they are receiving and reading. Most local school administrators and teachers feel inadequate in translating research findings into "things to do" unless they are able to discuss it with an outside resource person.

   Helping clients develop skills in various aspects of information seeking and usage (e.g., recognizing the need for information and the potential of R & D to address it, expanding their knowledge of information sources, understanding procedures for requesting and obtaining relevant information, applying RD & D in local improvement efforts is an important role that must be filled.

Although the following comments are mainly in the form of observations or impressions and don't qualify as "learnings" in the strictest sense, they seem important enough to include here.

- Practice dissemination from the practitioners' perspective in a proactive manner.
- Never promise more than can be delivered.
- Build interpersonal relationships (internally, with LEAs and with outside agencies, organizations which can provide information and services) and establish confidence in staff's ability to respond to client needs.
- Develop staff skills and competencies that enable efficient delivery of user-determined services.
- Establish credibility and a positive image among clients (users must be convinced that staff <u>wants</u> to help, will help, and is capable of providing needed assistance).
- Telling people how great the program is ins't enough. The staff must work continuously to <u>demonstrate</u> (by performance)

that the services provided are worthwhile, practical and personalized. Staff must convince users that they are sincere, capable and interested in providing services (must "sell" themselves as well as program).

- A great deal of interaction (as much face-to-face as possible) between staff and clients on a fairly regular basis is important (personal contact over a long period of time) as is frequent communication and interaction between and among individual collaborative members.
- Always keep in mind that there should be some WIIFM (What's In It For Me?) for everyone.
- We in education can solve more of our problems than we realize if we will stop depending upon someone else to solve all of the problems for us. There are tremendous, untapped potential solutions (in state) to many of our problems. For example, much progress can be made through inter- and intra-system sharing of ideas, programs, practices or by pooling of resources (especially human resources). This would require previously unexplored, imaginative approaches involving mutually beneficial cooperation and collaboration. An interpersonal network (both within and between schools and systems) should be established, promoted and supported.
- Another promising possibility is for local schools and systems to make greater use of the many cost-effective, successful programs and R & D products currently available for adaptation. Obviously, strong leadership, commitment and concern on the part of administrators would be critical to the success of such endeavors.

- Most change in schools occurs at the building or classroom level.
- Strong, positive leadership and commitment on the part of the building principal is critical in improvement efforts.
- A core or nucleus of educators (often a team comprised of a few committed teachers, the principal and one or more highly supportive, interested members of the central office staff) are important factors in change or improvement efforts.
- Long-term involvement of committed change agent(s), both within and without system, and frequent personal interaction among all parties does bring about change.

MINUTES

CAUSE Policy Council Meeting
June 16, 1982
Blair Conference Room, State Office Building
Montgomery, Alabama

PRESENT. Policy Council members: Dr. R. Meade Guy (Project Administrator); Deborah W. Berry; Deborah L. Bolden; Otis H. Brunson; Thomas J. Damson; Theodore R. Hawkins; Charles V. Lang; Betty Lee (Alternate); Tom Ryan (AEL); Dr. Frank Schneider; Dr. Wayman B. Shiver, Jr.; William R. Tillery; B. Lynne Wells (Birmingham Coordinator)

Project Staff: Marie Scott (Project Director, Mobile Coordinator), Chairperson; Maureen C. Cassidy; Judy E. Howell; Dr. John W. Roth

SDE administration: Dr. Richard McBride

CAUSE NIE Project Officer: Dr. Claiborne Richardson

CALL TO ORDER: Scott called the meeting to order at 10:17 a.m. Scott introduced Guy.

WELCOME/OPENING REMARKS: Guy introduced Dr. Richard McBride, Director, Division of Legislative Relations and Research, for welcome and opening remarks. Guy welcomed particularly Dr. Claiborne Richardson, CAUSE Project Officer from NIE and explained the change in Project Directorship for year two.

REVIEW OF YEAR ONE: Scott noted the primary focus of year one activities: establishing relationships, setting up governance of collaborative; building linkages, increasing LEAs' awareness of accounting successes and failures (documentation). Listed the major activities which included establishing the Policy Council, the concept of consensus, and involvement with parents, teachers, and principals.

MAJOR ACTIVITIES/ACCOMPLISHMENTS: Schneider reported on the Local Need Assessment Conference in Mobile, a most outstanding process involving some 75 people, a good cross section. About 100 different items/needs were identified. Was most impressed by the system of prioritizing. Noted that the needs identified by CAUSE matched system needs.

Berry summarized the synthesis process (Montgomery). This attempt to arrive at collaborative/collective needs ended with about a dozen needs which were submitted to the Policy Council. Stressed particularly the commonality of problems between the two systems. Was impressed by the fact of the "other" system having good ideas for solutions to problems. Commented favorably on the getting-together of the two urban systems.

Lang summarized briefly the Resource Conference at Lakepoint. His favorable comments included these: The amount of information shared was incredible ; expertise was present from all over the country; the time spent was just right.

CAUSE Policy Council Meeting
June 16, 1982
Montgomery, Alabama

Tillery commented that his main pleasure about the Lakepoint Conference was that there was no distortion from the announced program.

Damson was favorably impressed at Lakepoint by the fact that, as a business person, he was able to speak his mind freely in the conference setting.

Scott distributed the minutes of the final Policy Council meeting asking Policy Council members to note especially the outcome "to attempt, within resources available, to address the proposed goals and to focus upon improving school-community relations with teacher effectiveness, teacher morale and career/vocational guidance and counseling being addressed under the school-community umbrella."

Scott asked Policy Council members to enumerate several spin-offs resulting from CAUSE activities in year one.

Hawkins reported hearing about Talents Unlimited at the Eufaula conference. Reported the successful adoption of this NDN program in his school in Birmingham at the second, third and fourth grade levels. Reported a high degree of enthusiasm among teachers and students.

Shiver reported on his visit to the School Volunteer Development Project (SVDP) having heard about the program through CAUSE. Now has SVSP in about 40 Birmingham schools and is looking forward to help now from the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce. Has had success with parent volunteers and recognition from the community.

Brunson described Mobile's involvement in and use of Jane Stallings' methods and materials. Awareness of this program first came about through AIDS and through CAUSE. The program has been of tremendous value for Mobile's instructional observation system. Stallings' concepts have been incorporated into the Mobile staff development program. The five-day Stallings' awareness and training program was cost effective for Mobile because CAUSE helped identify outside funding sources. It has become evident that Mobile has adopted her philosophy: Teachers do make a difference.

Scott noted another Mobile spin-off resulting from CAUSE, i.e., assistance with the bilingual/ESL program.

Scott mentioned one negative factor: Everybody got so enthusiastic that it was impossible to keep up with demands.

BACKGROUND ON CONTINUATION FUNDING: Guy reported history of continuation funding. Efforts to secure continuation funding begin immediately after the October Policy Council meeting and culminated just two weeks ago. Following extensive reporting and negotiating (which included numerous telephone calls, correspondence and a trip to Washington, the CAUSE staff was successful in receiving the maximum funding ($60,000) available from NIE. In addition, the

CAUSE Policy Council Meeting
June 16, 1982
Montgomery, Alabama

funding period was extended through May, 1983. Guy presented significant findings learned from year one of CAUSE as reported in the proposal for continued funding.

YEAR TWO ACTIVITIES UPDATE FROM LEAs/REESTABLISHING POLICY COUNCIL: Scott commented on commitment from AEL in person of Tom Ryan attending Policy Council meeting and introduced Office of Research staff members and Dr. Claiborne Richardson, CAUSE Project Officer.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF FUTURE ACTIVITIES: Wells presented an update on CAUSE in Birmingham. All committees have been formed and are in operation. Five schools will participate in CAUSE during year two--one high school and four elementary schools (K-8).

Scott reported that three Mobile schools have recommitted to participate in CAUSE: one elementary, one middle, and one high school.

Scott distributed the handout "Description of Project Activities by Quarter." Commented on participation of Chamber of Commerce and reviewed selected activities:

- August Problem Analysis Conference
- Staff will be working in the next few weeks on problems of improving school/community relations
- Staff will provide direct technical assistance
- October Joint Planning Conference
- Remainder of time will be spent working on local improvement efforts
- April Dissemination Conference (DID)-- show and tell--will be the culminating activity for the year

Lang moved to accept the activities as projected; Hawkins seconded motion.

Brunson called for review of the number of meetings scheduled because of funding constraints. Scott assured members that there was sufficient money available for all meetings proposed.

Policy Council approved activities by consensus.

RESPONSIBILITY/PROCEDURES FOR DECISION MAKING: The handout "Major Decisions to be Made: was distributed and members were asked to mark views about who

CAUSE Policy Council Meeting
June 16, 1982
Montgomery, Alabama

should be responsible. Scott led discussion to arrive at collective decison.

Lang moved that approval of incentive grants to local schools, acceptance of mini-grant proposals for local schools and approval of matching grants to local schools be handled by both Local System Advisory Committee and Local School Project Committee.

Shiver moved that approval of incentive grants to LEAs' acceptance of mini-grant proposals for LEAs and approval of matching grants to LEAs be approved by Policy Council.

Guy stated that funds can be subcontracted only to school systems.

Discussion was lengthy and lively about some issues, particularly about approval of local school improvement plans. Final Policy Council decision reached on this item was: Local System Advisory Committee informed of all local school improvement plans and progress. Any questionable proposals will be referred to the Policy Council. The Council agreed upon the following procedure for individual school plans. The plan should originate with the Local School Project Committee, be signed by the Principal and then be forwarded to the system Superintendent for approval before submission to the Local System Advisory Committee. Submission deadlines for plans/proposals will be set by the Local System Advisory Committee. Once established and made known to member schools well in advance, deadlines should be met without exception.

Another decison reached: Project staff makes decisons on conference designs. There will be input from the Policy Council as part of the process. The Policy Council needs to be aware of and informed about designs as well as being able to provide input and reactions to Staff recommendations.

Concerning the "Design of DID Conference"--the project staff will be responsible for design and decisions, with input from the Policy Council, the Local System Advisory Committee and the Local School Project Committee. Much active involvement in design and decision from the two committees is anticipated.

The decisions decided on by the Policy Council are presented graphically in the following chart.

MAJOR DECISIONS TO BE MADE

	Staff	Policy Council	Local System Advisory Committee	Local School Project Committee
Desire to continue Collaborative	x	x		
Design of year two program and activities	x	x		
Reorganization of Project governance	x*			
Desire to continue as pilot school				x
Selection of pilot schools in LEAs			x	
Approval of incentive grants to local schools			x	x
Acceptance of mini-grant proposals for local schools			x	x
Approval of matching grants to local school			x	x
Approval of incentive grants to LEAs		x		
Acceptance of mini-grant proposals for LEAs		x		
Approval of matching grants to LEAs		x		
Approval of year two project activities	x	x		
Approval of local school improvement plans		x	x	
Design of Joint Planning Conference	x	x	x	x
Design of DID Conference	x	x	x	x

* Input from LEA representatives

CAUSE Policy Council Meeting
June 16, 1982
Montgomery, Alabama

Policy Council adjourned for lunch at 12:40 p.m.

Policy Council reconvened at 1:45 p.m.

POLICY COUNCIL INPUT ON PROGRAM/FUNDING ISSUES: Guy reviewed budget for year two--provided handout of revised budget.

Scott explained the following budget items:

Project Support Activities	Estimated	Budgeted
Washington trip	$ 1,100	
Coordinator planning in Montgomery	.430	
Policy Council meeting (June 16)	1,000	
Joint Conference (all expenses plus consulting fee)--includes substitutes, per diem (note: if outside funding is secured, CAUSE money will be put into incentive grants	5,000	
DID Conference--Mobile and Birmingham (representative team will go to other system)	2,500	
Joint staff meetings	2,400	
Technical assistance (travel by SDE)	1,600	
	$14,030	$16,200

Available for Incentive Grants

$12,400 budgeted, plus $2,170 balance from above (difference between $16,200 and $14,030) provides $14,570 in incentive funds to be divided equally between the two collaborating systems. (See handout--"Incentive Financial Assistance"-- for guidelines pertaining to allocation of funds.)

SUGGESTIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF RESOURCE BANK: Cassidy reviewed activities of Alabama Resource File developed by Office of Research over past five years.

Policy Council broke into four groups of approximately four Policy Council members Each group discussed a particular aspect of development of a CAUSE resource bank. Results of discussion (as reported back by a representative from each group) are as follows:

Group I

Task: List every possible means of securing and depositing local school resources (human, material, financial) into the Resource Bank.

CAUSE Policy Council Meeting
June 16, 1982
Montgomery, Alabama

Securing:

1. Newspaper ads (local coordinator)
2. Local school surveys (administrative and individual schools
3. Local school newsletters
4. Local systems newsletters
5. School volunteer program
6. Chamber of Commerce (businesses)
7. Community schools
8. Libraries
9. Faculty meetings
10. Universities

Depositing:

1. Local classroom
2. Local school (tabulate and/or list)
3. Local coordinator

Quality Control Criteria:

Infusion of resources/include those which are successfully implemented.

Group II

Task: List all possible methods for classifying and storing identified resources.

Classifying by:

- function
- subject and title
- cross reference
- LEA
- name of responsible person
- grade level--age
- type of school (magnet, vocational, elementary, etc.)

CAUSE Policy Council Meeting
June 16, 1982
Montgomery, Alabama

- application--school/community
- instructional methodology
- curriculum (content)
- staff development
- management--school administration
- cost and funding sources
- chronologically

Storing:

- computer
  - central
  - micro
- manual
  - Dewey Decimal
  - key sort
- loose-leaf storage at each LEA with periodic update
- regional vs. statewide

Group III

Task: List every possible method of accounting for and communicating Resource Bank holdings

- newsletters--other media
- in-service programs/specialized
- subject area bibliographies
- special staff development workshops targeted toward special groups
- computer, e.g., Birmingham-Mobile linkage

Group IV

Task: List every possible means of withdrawing and utilizing resources ("*" indicates particularly feasible means--"?" indicates possible means).

* Contact/facilitator to call (centrally located)
* Contact/facilitator to call (local system)
* Contact/facilitator to call (building level coordinator)
* SDE Office of Research to serve as Clearinghouse (CH)

CAUSE Policy Council Meeting
June 16, 1982
Montgomery, Alabama

* Information/Resource Request Form

  Computerized file accessible from terminals in local system/school

? Resource center (CH) screen response., select, analyze, synthesize, summarize and deliver

* Need Resource Catalog

* Need training for "Linkers"

? Broker human resources

Scott questioned Policy Council--should the effort be made to develop a Resource Bank? Policy Council consensus opinion was YES.

JOINT PLANNING CONFERENCE: Staff will initiate plans for Joint Conference and will inform all members.

NEXT POLICY COUNCIL MEETING: The next Policy Council meeting is scheduled to be in conjunction with Joint Conference.

CLOSING COMMENTS AND EVALUATION: Scott distributed evaluation form and asked all Policy Council members for evaluation of meeting.

Scott particularly noted participation of representatives of the Chamber of Commerce.

Scott thanked Dr. Claiborne Richardson for coming to Policy Council meeting.

Scott adjourned Policy Council meeting at 3:17 p.m.

Summary of Evaluations of
CAUSE Policy Council Meeting
June 16, 1982
(n=7)

Method:

- A mean score was calculated for each item
- A grand mean was calculated for the complete instrument
- Items are reported as falling "above" or "below" the grand mean
- Note: Respondents assigned all items a "3" or "2" indicating a "high degree" or "satisfactory" level of achievement of the objective or condition. No item was assigned a "1" or a "minimal" level.

Items Which Received an "Above Average" Rating

Mean	Item
3.0	To bring Policy Council members up-to-date on status of funding for Project CAUSE.
3.0	To afford members of Policy Council the opportunity to get acquainted and/or reacquainted and to establish or extend rapport with colleagues from other agencies.
3.0	There was evidence of planning and careful preparations for the session.
3.0	The agenda provided structure and served a useful purpose.
3.0	The social atmosphere or climate was conducive to free and open discussion and interactions.
3.0	The meeting facilitators provided group with sufficient leadership.
2.86	To reestablish the Policy Council as Project CAUSE's primary vehicle for shared decision making.
2.86	By the conclusion of the session all participants seemed to have a clear understanding of the purposes of the meeting.
2.86	Plans were made to follow up on decisions reached.

Items which Received a "Below Average" Rating

Mean	Item
2.43	Decisions were reached as appropriate.
2.43	The physical arrangement for the meeting were acceptable.
2.43	To orient Policy Council members to proposed year two activities as well as to the responsibilities of the Policy Council as outlined in the Project proposal.
2.57	When the meeting concluded participants understood the roles and responsibilities of all parties to the collaborative.
2.71	Participants left with a clear understanding of "where we are headed" and "what CAUSE is all about."
2.71	To decide about the methods and procedures for decision making to be used during year two.
2.71	To review activities and accomplishments of Project CAUSE's planning year.

Other Suggestions

Seven suggestions were received.

- Four dealt with a need for larger meeting facility with a better setting arrangement.
- Two suggested handout material be distributed and reviewed prior to meeting.
- One suggested more time was needed.

Project CAUSE Joint Conference

February 1, 1983

The CAUSE Joint Conference was held in Montgomery in the Alabama State Employees Retirement Systems Building. Participants were as follows:

Mobile (3 pilots represented	Birmingham (5 pilot represented)
3 Principals	4 Principals
2 Parents/Community	5 Parents
2 Instructional Specialists	2 Central Office Administrators
3 Central Office Administrators	11 Teachers
6 Teachers	2 Students
1 Student	

AEL	SDE
1 representative	3 representatives

The major goal of the conference was to provide participants from the member agencies an opportunity for face-to-face interaction on the accomplishments and needs of their school improvement programs. Activities focused around several different one-to-one, small group and large group work sessions with a variety of matchings by role type/program needs/grade and subject levels/etc. Short technical assistance idea sharing/resource exploration sessions were provided by staff members when requested by individuals or single schools.

Both direct and indirect benefits were noted by participants at the close of the conference. The enthusiasm and sense of "ownership" displayed by individuals and school teams increased as the day progressed. The mutual support and interest shown in pilot school programs by other school teams was apparent. While the focal point of exchange between participants was relatively general, the practical nature of the information exchanged made it most valuable.

During the afternoon session the Policy Council members met. Included in their actions was the approval of the LEAs' mini-grant proposals and preliminary decisions on the dissemination conferences to be held in April and May. Discussions were held on the following:

- documentation of local pilots and systems' programs
- sub-contracts and disbursement of funds
- possible dates for spring conferences
- procedures for matching-grants proposal submissions

Meeting Evaluation
CAUSE Policy Council
June 16, 1982
(n=7)

Instructions: Please respond candidly to each item on this evaluation. Your responses will be used to improve future sessions.

A. Indicate the extent to which you feel each designated objective was achieved by placing the appropriate number in the blank preceding the item.

3 = To a High Degree
2 = Adequately
1 = Minimally

Mean

2.80 1. To reestablish the Policy Council as Project CAUSE's primary vehicle for shared decision making.

2.71 2. To review activities and accomplishments of Project CAUSE's planning year.

3.0 3. To bring Policy Council members up-to-date on status of funding for Project CAUSE.

2.43 4. To orient Policy Council members to proposed year two activities as well as to the responsibilities of the Policy Council as outlined in the Project proposal.

2.71 5. To decide about the methods and procedures for decision making to be used during year two.

2.60 6. To obtain Policy Council input concerning program issues and plans during year two.

3.0 7. To afford members of Policy Council the opportunity to get acquainted and/or reacquainted and to establish or extend rapport with colleagues from other agencies.

B. To what extent do you feel each condition listed below was achieved?

3 = To a High Degree
2 = At a Satisfactory Level
1 = Minimal

2.86 1. By the conclusion of the session all participants seemed to have a clear understanding of the purposes of the meeting.

3.0 2. There was evidence of planning and careful preparations for the session.

3.0 3. The agenda provided structure and served a useful purpose.

3.0 4. The social atmosphere or climate was conducive to free and open discussion and interactions.

2.43 5. Decisions were reached as appropriate.

Mean

3.0 6. The meeting facilitators provided group with sufficient leadership.

2.86 7. Plans were made to follow up on decisions reached.

2.43 8. The physical arrangements for the meeting were acceptable.

2.57 9. When the meeting concluded participants understood the roles and responsibilities of all parties to the collaborative.

2.71 10. Participants left with a clear understanding of "where we are headed" and "what CAUSE is all about."

C. Offer three suggestions that you feel would improve future meetings of the Policy Council:

1. _____

_____

2. _____

_____

3. _____

_____

D. Other comments/suggestions:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

DIVISION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT

PROJECT CAUSE
DISSEMINATION CONFERENCE

Pre-Vocational/Career-Vocational Programs

April 28, 1983

11:00 A.M.

11:00 - 11:05	Welcome.....	Otis H. Brunson
11:05 - 11:15	Overview of CAUSE.....	Marie Scott
11:15 - 12:15	Hillsdale's Plan for Improvement	Charles Lang and Faculty
12:15 - 1:00	"Buzz Session" Lunch	
1:00 - 3:30	How to Develop and Implement Programs.....	Dr. David Winefortner
3:30 - 4:00	Summary.....	Marie Scott

COLLABORATIVE FOR ALABAMA URBAN SCHOOL EDUCATORS

- Birmingham City School System
- Mobile County School System
- Alabama State Department of Education
- Appalachia Educational Laboratory
- Birmingham Chamber of Commerce
- Mobile Chamber of Commerce

A COLLABORATIVE EFFORT FUNDED BY THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

MOBILE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DIVISION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT

WORKSHOP COMPILATION

WORKSHOP TITLE: Cause Dissemination Conference DATE: April 28, 1983
AM: X
PM: X

Please check level:

___ Kindergarten
___ Elementary
___ Middle
___ High
___ Other: ___ Position

Please check position:

X Teacher	X Instr. Spec.	___ Paraprofessional
X Principal	___ Area Office	___ Maintenance
X Asst. Prin.	X Central Office	___ Custodian
X Counselor	___ Secretary/Clerk	
___ Librarian	___ Substitute	

We hope you have found this workshop useful. In order to help us make proper adjustments for future workshops, please check the categories which best describe your evaluation and your comments. The results will be kept anonymous, so it is not necessary to sign the evaluation.

TO WHAT DEGREE . . .	5	4	3	2	1	No
. . . is the content useful/applicable?	6	3	1			
. . . were the objectives appropriate?	8	1				1
. . . were the leaders effective?	9		1			

TO WHAT DEGREE HAS THIS WORKSHOP . . .	5	4	3	2	1
. . . provided new information?	6	3	1		
. . . provided insight/understanding?	7	2		1	
. . . provided helpful techniques/materials/suggestions?	8	1	1		
. . . motivated you to try new ideas in your daily work?	7	2		1	
. . . motivated you to share your knowledge/experiences/concepts?	6	3		1	
. . . motivated/enabled you to develop/formulate/utilize new ideas/concepts/approaches of your own?	7	2		1	

Additional Comments

A. 2 None

B. 2 All

C.

D. Very Good Program --Dr. Windfordner did a fantastic job.--The materials offered were excellent--GREAT!!

Project CAUSE

DISSEMINATION CONFERENCE

Parent Involvement/School-Community Relations

April 26, 1983

10:00 A.M.

10:00 - 10:15	Overview of CAUSE.....	Marie Scott
10:15 - 11:15	Shaw's Plan for Improvement....	Charles Pettus and Shaw Faculty
11:15 - 12:15	"What Are Others Doing?".....	Dr. Ed Gotts
12:15 - 1:00	Lunch "Buzz Session"	
1:00 - 2:30	"What Can Happen In Mobile?"...	Dr. Ed Gotts
2:30 - 3:00	Summary.....	Marie Scott

COLLABORATIVE FOR ALABAMA URBAN SCHOOL EDUCATORS

- Birmingham City School System
- Mobile County School System
- Alabama State Department of Education
- Appalachia Educational Laboratory
- Birmingham Chamber of Commerce
- Mobile Chamber of Commerce

A COLLABORATIVE EFFORT FUNDED BY THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

MOBILE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DIVISION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT

WORKSHOP COMPILATION

WORKSHOP TITLE: CAUSE Dissemination Conference DATE: April 26, 1983
AM: X
PM: X

Please check level:

____ Kindergarten
____ Elementary
____ Middle
____ High
____ Other: ____ Position

Please check position:

____ Teacher	X Instr. Spec.	____ Paraprofessional	
X Principal	____ Area Office	____ Maintenance	
____ Asst. Prin.	____ Central Office	____ Custodian	
X Counselor	____ Secretary/Clerk		
X Librarian	____ Substitute	X Speech Pathologist	

We hope you have found this workshop useful. In order to help us make proper adjustments for future workshops, please check the categories which best describe your evaluation and your comments. The results will be kept anonymous, so it is not necessary to sign the evaluation.

TO WHAT DEGREE . . .	5	4	3	2	1	No Re
. . . is the content useful/applicable? **********	9	2				
. . . were the objectives appropriate? **********	8	2				1
. . . were the leaders effective? **********	7	2		1		1

TO WHAT DEGREE HAS THIS WORKSHOP . . .	5	4	3	2	1
. . . provided new information? **********	5	4	2		
. . . provided insight/understanding? **********	5	4	2		
. . . provided helpful techniques/materials/suggestions? **********	6	4	1		
. . . motivated you to try new ideas in your daily work? **********	6	5			
. . . motivated you to share your knowledge/experiences/concepts?	4	6			
. . . motivated/enabled you to develop/formulate/utilize new ideas/concepts/approaches of your own? **********	6	5			

Additional Comments:

A. Statistics on studies not as relative--1 None--Lecture time by consultant should be decreased--

B. 1 All--Excellent presentation by Shaw Group, use our own folks more often!--Local school project presentation

C. None--Question & Answer session with Pettus and company--Rearrange time schedule

D. Great!!--Excellent program on "Show Off Shaw"--Very organized useful information --Very interesting and informative, much food for thought--Workshop was very helpful and informative--

Survey of Major Participants

Project CAUSE

Explanation: In order for us to evaluate the collaborative, it is important to collect certain additional data from major project participants. Please respond to each item on this survey in a completely honest and candid manner.

A. How accurately or to what extent does each of the following statements reflect your feelings about your involvement in this project, your presence here today? Please circle the number beneath the response that best reflects your present attitude.

	Extremely well	Moderately well	Slightly	Not at all	No opportunity to assess
1. My time would be better spent at home working on my regularly assigned responsibilities.	1	1	3	10	0
2. This is "just another" request for me to represent my school/ school system or agency at a basically ceremonial function.	0	0	1	14	0
3. I am optimistic that I will experience new learnings and gain valuable insights.	12	1	1	0	1
4. I am hopeful that this collaborative effort will promote exchange of ideas, programs and solutions among collaborating parties and will result in savings in time and dollars.	14	1	0	0	0
5. I don't hold out much hope for our establishing a permanent collaborative of the four involved agencies (i.e., Birmingham City and Mobile County School Systems, the State Department of Education and the Appalachia Educational Laboratory.	2	3	2	7	1

6. The opportunity to interact with colleagues and citizens from other agencies and cities is exciting.	12	2	1	0	0
7. This project may afford us an opportunity for some "good press".	9	3	2	1	0
8. I don't like to expend my energy in trying to establish new interpersonal relationships.	0	1	1	13	0
9. Involvement in this project may provide some additional financial resources that will enable our schools to do some otherwise impossible things.	13	1	1	0	0
10. I'm afraid this effort will be a "flop" and that I'll be associated with a failure.	0	0	2	12	1

To what extent are you personally committed to the formation and maintenance of this collaborative?

8 Extremely 6 Moderately 1 Slightly 0 Not at all

Comments:

B. How accurately or to what extent does each of the following statements reflect your assessment of most of your (home agency's) colleagues' attitudes concerning educational innovation and improvement efforts?

Please circle the number beneath the response that best reflects present attitudes.

	Extremely well	Moderately well	Slightly	Not at all	No opportunity to assess
1. They are more likely to "try out" some new approaches when receiving support from colleagues who are also attempting the same innovation.	3	8	2	2	0
2. They are generally satisfied with the status quo and somewhat resistant to change.	0	2	9	4	0
3. They are usually excited about creating something "from the ground up".	2	11	2	0	0
4. They are strongly attached to "home grown" programs and solutions and are generally suspicious of programs and/or solutions imported from other school systems or agencies.	3	10	1	1	0
5. They are basically disenchanted with federal funding and involvement in local school improvement efforts.	1	3	3	8	0
6. They will sense that resources available through this project can assist in solving an already identified local problem.	11	2	1	1	0
7. They are sensitive to being a part of a large and urban school system and feel our somewhat unique needs have not been historically attended to by the State Department of Education.	1	2	7	5	0

8. They take great pride in their own creativity and authorship and are generally reluctant to share credit with others.	0	1	9	5	0
9. They believe our large urban system has somewhat unique problems in this basically rural state and will probably relate well to the purposes of this project.	2	2	10	1	0
10. They are sensitive to their own and our agency's deficiencies and are reluctant to share problems and needs with "outsiders".	3	4	7	1	0
11. They appreciate opportunities to share successes with others and to see deserving colleagues receive recognition.	12	2	1	0	0
12. They don't know much about "what's happening" inside the other agencies involved in this collaborative and will probably doubt that "they" have much to offer "us".	2	1	10	2	0
13. They are basically skeptical about educational research and development.	2	2	2	9	0

To what extent do you believe most of your immediate colleagues have been committed to the formation and maintenance of this collaborative and to the successful completion of activities?

__0__ Extremely __8__ Moderately __6__ Slightly __1__ Not at all

Comments:

C. How accurately or to what extent does each of the following statements reflect your evaluation of the collaborative?

Please circle the number beneath the response that best reflects present attitudes.

	Extremely well	Moderately well	Slightly	Not at all	No opportunity to assess
1. During the course of my involvement with the project I have witnessed a strong commitment to the collaborative by my fellow participants.	7	4	4	0	0
2. During the course of my involvement with the project I have wintessed a strong commitment to improving school/ community relations.	8	5	2	0	0
3. I am confident that the involvement with CAUSE has enabled my school/ system to make improvements which would have been less likely to occur without CAUSE.	8	6	1	0	0
4. Project CAUSE has provided resources which otherwise were unavailable to me.	12	3	0	0	0
5. Involvement with CAUSE has changed my behavior in terms of utilizing RD & D information in planning school programs/ activities/etc.	9	4	2	0	0
6. Involvement with CAUSE has encouraged me to become involved in local school improvement.	6	8	1	0	0
7. Involvement with CAUSE has strengthened my skills in planning.	7	6	1	0	0

8. Involvement with CAUSE has strengthened my skills in relating to and interacting with others.	3	7	4	1	0
9. Involvement with CAUSE has strengthened my skills in assessing needs.	7	8	0	0	0
10. Involvement with CAUSE has strengthened my skill in identifying and utilizing resources.	4	9	1	0	0
11. Involvement with CAUSE has strengthened my skills in evaluating and documenting programs/activities/efforts of an education improvement nature.	7	6	2	0	0
12. I feel the time expended in my involvement with CAUSE has been justified in terms of benefits received.	9	5	1	0	0

BIRMINGHAM APPENDIX G

Survey of Major Participants

Project CAUSE

Explanation: In order for us to evaluate the collaborative, it is important to collect certain attitudinal data from major project participants. Please respond to each item on this survey in a completely honest and candid manner.

A. How accurately or to what extent does each of the following statements reflect your feelings about your involvement in this project, your presence here today? Please circle the number beneath the response that best reflects your present attitude.

	Extremely well	Moderately well	Slightly	Not at all	No opportunity to assess	No Response
1. My time would be better spent at home working on my regularly assigned responsibilities.	2	3	1	9	0	2
2. This is "just another" request for me to represent my school/ school system or agency at a basically ceremonial function.	3	0	2	10	0	2
3. I am optimistic that I will experience new learnings and gain valuable insights.	10	4	1	0	0	2
4. I am hopeful that this collaborative effort will promote exchange of ideas, programs and solutions among collaborating parties and will result in savings in time and dollars.	7	8	0	0	0	2
5. I don't hold out much hope for our establishing a permanent collaborative of the four involved agencies (i.e., Birmingham City and Mobile County School Systems, the State Department of Education and the Appalachia Educational Laboratory.	0	5	4	6	0	2

6. The opportunity to interact with colleagues and citizens from other agencies and cities is exciting.	10	5	0	0	0	2
7. This project may afford us an opportunity for some "good press."	8	1	0	2	3	3
8. I don't like to expend my energy in trying to establish new interpersonal relationships.	2	2	0	7	3	3
9. Involvement in this project may provide some additional financial resources that will enable our schools to do some otherwise impossible things.	9	4	2	0	0	2
10. I'm afraid this effort will be a "flop" and that I'll be associated with a failure.	0	1	0	13	1	2

To what extent are you personally committed to the formation and maintenance of this collaborative?

11 Extremely 3 Moderately 1 Slightly 0 Not at all 0 No Respo

Comments: Summary too complex and lengthy. Many questions on Sec. #1 and Sec. #5 were repetitive. Instrument should have been more concise.

This Project should never have to "die". Somehow the needed funding should be obtained some way. As it is, however, the strain on our Central Office people is very strong.

B. How accurately or to what extent does each of the following statements reflect your assessment of most of your (home agency's) colleagues' attitudes concerning educational innovation and improvement efforts?

Please circle the number beneath the response that best reflects present attitudes.

	Extremely well	Moderately well	Slightly	Not at all	No opportunity to assess	No Respo
1. They are more likely to "try out" some new approaches when receiving support from colleagues who are also attempting the same innovation.	9	7	1	0	0	0
2. They are generally satisfied with the status quo and somewhat resistant to change.	1	5	3	7	1	0
3. They are usually excited about creating something "from the ground up."	9	7	1	0	0	0
4. They are strongly attached to "home grown" programs and solutions and are generally suspicious of programs and/or solutions imported from other school systems or agencies.	2	1	5	9	0	0
5. They are basically disenchanted with Federal funding and involvement in local school improvement efforts.	1	1	4	11	0	0
6. They will sense that resources available through this project can assist in solving an already identified local problem.	7	7	3	0	0	0
7. They are sensitive to being a part of a large and urban school system and feel our somewhat unique needs have not been historically attended to by the State Department of Education.	1	5	7	2	1	1

8. They take great pride in their own creativity and authorship and are generally reluctant to share credit with others.	1	2	2	12	0	0
9. They believe our large urban system has somewhat unique problems in this basically rural state and will probably relate well to the purposes of this project.	9	4	2	1	1	0
10. They are sensitive to their own and our agency's deficiencies and are reluctant to share problems and needs with "outsiders."	2	0	2	12	1	0
12. They appreciate opportunities to share successes with others and to see deserving colleagues receive recognition.	11	6	0	0	0	0
13. They don't know much about "what's happening" inside the other agencies involved in this collaborative and will probably doubt that "they" have much to offer "us."	1	2	3	8	2	1
14. They are basically skeptical about educational research and development.	1	1	3	12	0	0

To what extent do you believe most of your immediate colleagues have been committed to the formation and maintenance of this collaborative and to the successful completion of activities?

7 Extremely 10 Moderately 0 Slightly 0 Not at all 0 No Response

Comments:

C. How accurately or to what extent does each of the following statements reflect your evaluation of the collaborative?

Please circle the number beneath the response that best reflects present attitudes.

1. During the course of my involvement with the project I have witnessed a strong commitment to the collaborative by my fellow participants.	11	3	3	1	0	0
2. During the course of my involvement with the project I have witnessed a strong commitment to improving school-community relations.	13	4	0	0	0	0
3. I am confident that the involvement with CAUSE has enabled my school/system to make improvements which would have been less likely to occur without CAUSE.	11	5	0	1	0	0
4. Project CAUSE has provided resources which otherwise were unavailable to me.	10	4	3	0	0	0
5. Involvement with CAUSE has changed my behavior in terms of utilizing RD&D information in planning school programs/activities/etc.	7	7	1	0	0	2
6. Involvement with CAUSE has encouraged me to become involved in local school improvement.	12	5	0	0	0	0
7. Involvement with CAUSE has strengthened my skills in planning.	4	8	3	0	0	2

8. Involvement with CAUSE has strengthened my skills in relating to and interacting with others.	9	6	1	1	0	0
9. Involvement with CAUSE has strengthened my skills in assessing needs.	8	7	1	1	0	0
10. Involvement with CAUSE has strengthened my skills in identifying and utilizing resources.	7	7	3	0	0	0
11. Involvement with CAUSE has strengthened my skills in evaluating and documenting programs/activities/efforts of an education improvement nature.	6	9	2	0	0	0
12. I feel the time expended in my involvement with CAUSE has been justified in terms of benefits received.	11	5	0	1	0	0